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Early Stuart England (1603-1649) was dramatically transformed by the first two Stuart monarchs, James I and Charles I. Less appreciated, the art and architecture of the early Stuarts, and the politics of the Absolute state, were strongly influenced by Catholic thought and Catholic iconography. The present study reevaluates the impact of Catholicism in church polity and material culture under the influence of the early Stuarts. Marking a clear departure from the art and display of the Elizabethan age, the Stuarts, I argue, introduced a “Culture of Image” that helped define the relationship between Catholicism and the English Absolute state. Both Stuart kings aimed self-consciously to use Catholic iconography to solidify and extend their Absolutist Claims. Evidence for Catholic influence is found in their patterns of collection and commission, which show important deviations from earlier Protestant monarchs, Edward VI and Elizabeth I. The influence of Catholic iconography on English political culture has been largely overlooked. The surprisingly short list of scholarly publications on the topic contrasts sharply with an otherwise rich and nuanced Stuart historiography.

The present study is divided into eight chapters. Briefly, Chapter 1 introduces the broader historiographic context with particular attention to new issues identified in this study. Chapter 2
surveys the absolutist tendencies of the papacy and Hapsburgs as models of influence and iconographic inspiration. Continuing the theme, Chapter 3 focuses on Calvinist resistance to the religious expression of Imagery connected with church art and architecture, and importantly, with expressions of political Divine Right. Included in this chapter are examples of artistic expressions as they relate to English borrowings from other Reformed areas of Europe. Chapter 4 examines a defining political document written by James I, Basilikon Doron. A key inspiration for Charles, this work argues that the greatest danger to Divine Right came from local Puritanism, and further, that Presbyterianism and Puritanism threatened the stability of the English state. Chapter 5 complements these religious and political themes by addressing key Catholic influences on Charles before his accession to the throne, particularly Anne of Denmark, and among other influences, his brother Henry’s artistic fascination with Italy. Chapter 6 further documents Stuart use of Catholic iconography by analyzing the role of art in the theological movement toward Laudianism. Several key themes are brought together in Chapter 7, which focuses on Absolutism and Catholic art in Carline England; particular attention is given to the renovation at St. Paul’s Cathedral, and more generally, to Charles’ use of the royal image in sculpture and painting. The final Chapter, which serves as an Epilogue and Conclusion, evaluates the “Culture of Image” and its role in defining English Absolutism as an expression of Catholic art and iconography.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The two Stuart kings, James and Charles, brought important change to England. For inspiration to modernize, James I looked outside of England, a strategy more vigorously pursued by his successor Charles I. The political theory espoused by James was Absolutism, the Divine Right of Kings. Although some Protestant theoreticians championed this view of kingship, it was closely identified with Catholics. Following his father’s lead, Charles transformed England into the principal symbol of the absolute state. Central to their efforts, the early Stuarts used Catholic iconography as a statement and symbol of absolute political power. A central task of this study is to examine the contemporary literature and the artwork commissioned and collected by the early Stuarts in support of Catholicism Absolutism. This evidence, I argue, suggests that James and Charles developed cohesive policies in the choice of absolutist art and iconography that affirmed their rule as Divine Right monarchs. One consequence of these findings is that Catholic influence in England was considerably greater than previous historians have acknowledged. In support of these claims, this study aims to define absolutist art and to assess the cultural climate in early Stuart England. Importantly, it provides a detailed analysis of how James and Charles bolstered the Divine Right of Kings by creating a “Culture of Image.”

The present study offers a fresh analysis of these issues while filling a surprisingly large gap in scholarship. In the course of this study, I aim to address a series of questions only partially addressed, and sometimes entirely ignored, by cultural historians. These questions include: Was there significant Catholic influence in Stuart England? Did the Stuarts intentionally emulate the great Catholic monarchies in their display and commission of artwork for political and religious purposes? Was Catholic iconography present in these “Protestant” political works about Absolutism? How important were Catholics in early modern England,
especially the Stuart queens and members of court in formation of propaganda works for the regime? Did Catholicism, real or imagined by detractors of the Stuarts, play a greater role in the demise of Charles?

**Religious Terminology**

Religion in early Stuart England was complex and remains difficult to categorize with appropriate historical labels. For example, no single term exists to describe the ceremonial worship, the love of art, and sacramentalism. “Arminianism” is too limited; it defines a theology that is not necessarily involved with decorous settings or ceremonial worship, although, more than a few Arminians were involved in such things. As with the term Puritan, it is a commonly hostile term used by opponents. “Anglicanism” did not exist in common currency, although it is the direct descendant of this movement. Patrick Collinson used “Prayer-Book Protestantism” to describe this movement, but it is inaccurate. Much more than only the Prayer Book was involved in their thought and practices. It is also cumbersome to use. “Laudianism” does not apply to the entire period, not least because some “Laudians” came before Laud, among them Hooker and Andrewes. Anti-Calvinism also presents difficulties. Some supporters of ceremonial religion and art employed elements of Calvinist thought in their writings. In sum, rather than contribute new terminology, I will use anti-Calvinism, Laudianism, and Arminianism, as interchangeable terms to describe a religion of ceremony, sacramentalism, and use of image for spiritual and political ends.

**Contribution to Scholarship**

Catholic influence and iconography have been under-appreciated in Early Modern England, particularly in the context of absolutist and religious art commissioned or collected in early Stuart England. This avenue of research illuminates key problems encountered in Stuart studies. At the center of this discussion is the early Stuart monarchy, its use of art as
propaganda, and those influences that led James and Charles to sponsor such art. In its central focus, this study investigates the influence of Catholic-based absolutist art and architecture as models for the Stuart court, and the successful use of art and its ultimate collapse during the reign of Charles I. A related argument of this study is the renewal of the use of religiously-themed art in collections and commissions for personal and public consumption. Absolutism, above all else, claimed a central religious theme: Absolute power came from revived traditions reflected in the Old Testament, the antiquity of the early church, and heroes such as Constantine and Charlemagne. As the first Christian emperor, Constantine was viewed as a Christian David or Christian Solomon, an instrument of God’s plan for state government. Charlemagne’s legend continued this tradition, and Western emperors, popes, and kings associated these figures with their own divine right to rule. Absolutism was inseparable from religion.

The dominant cultural center at the end of the sixteenth-century was southern European Catholicism. With France back in the Catholic fold, the three greatest European powers in 1600 were Spain, France, and the Holy Roman Empire. The Counter-Reformation was in full swing, and Spain was the colossus that sat astride the world. Charles V, Philip II, and Philip III were the most powerful monarchs of the day. After the Council of Trent, Rome was in the midst of political, religious, and artistic ascendancy through the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Among the most important influences for James and Charles to emulate were these Catholic monarchs of the south. Catholic monarchs continued and renewed imperial and theological iconography long before England’s Solomon. Evidence is presented that James I (from the middle of his reign) and Charles I (throughout the majority of his reign) adapted this absolutist religious tradition in art. They used relatively unchanged iconography in their public artistic contributions, as well as in their private commissions and patterns of collecting.
As Protestant monarchs, the Stuarts were out of step with other co-religionists. The lack of interest in art in general, or the use of art as a political or religious implement by Protestant monarchs, is central to understanding the visceral attack art produced for Charles. What the Stuarts achieved in England is easily distinguished from their Protestant counterparts. The renewed iconoclasm of the period was due to the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War. Differences in the use of art were evident even within dynasties including Elizabeth the Winter Queen (and sister of Charles I) and wife of Frederick V, the Elector of the Palatinate. Elizabeth and her husband helped inaugurate the Thirty Years’ War by orchestrating a scheme of iconoclasm in the great cathedral in Prague.  

A key area of scholarly concern focuses on the connections of James and Charles to other absolutist thinkers, whether directly, as with Marc Antonio De Dominis, or through court painters, such as Justus Lipsius. These Catholic thinkers enriched the religious debate, so vital to Catholic-Protestant relations, concerning the role of the monarch in the early modern state. They also contributed to ideological discussions involving the uses of art and architecture in support of absolutist ideas. These thinkers were prime examples of the fluidity of religious confessions and the notion that there was more agreement between Protestants and Catholics than generally acknowledged. Authors point out the great divergence in thought in “Protestantism.” Catholicism is sometimes treated as a monolithic religion that nodded predictably to papal authority. This study provides evidence that key thinkers associated with James and Charles described

---

1 With the election of Elector Frederick V, the Czech parliament vigorously promoted an iconoclastic agenda. The Winter King’s court preacher and advisor, Abraham Scultetus, was central in the agenda for the transformation of the Cathedral of St. Vitus into a Calvinist edifice. The “cleaning” of the cathedral did not have broad-based approval and was a factor in the collapse of support for Frederick as King of Bohemia and an important excuse for imperial intervention. As the destruction of art was destabilizing for Charles’s sister, the creation of art was destabilizing for Charles.
Catholicism and catholicity across a much broader spectrum. “Popery” is not the only mark of Catholicism. Some individuals defy useful categories. Fluidity of thought and “crossing” of confessional lines were important characteristics of the early modern.

This study contributes to a growing scholarship that considers the importance of the Catholic consorts of James and Charles in their religious and political choices, including the selection of artists who supported the royal display of Absolutism. Until recently, most of the historiography of early modern England has treated these women as peripheral. Anne of Denmark converted to Catholicism before her arrival in England. Henrietta Maria’s most important mission was to convert her husband, and then, through him, to show England the “true faith.” Anne’s more restrained Catholicism, and Henrietta Maria’s militant Catholicism, must be understood in relation to their husbands’ policies. Their influence is particularly evident in the arts of display and consumption at court.

Method and Approach

This study builds on the work of art historians, in concert with cultural, political, and religious historians, who have addressed the issue of Catholicism in early Stuart England. I examine Catholic iconography used by Catholic rulers and popes, and compare this iconography with Stuart output between 1603 and 1649. This study also includes analysis of documents that supported absolutism and the use of art as propaganda within the broader Catholic spectrum. These topics depart from the work of most historians of this period, where integration of the Stuart legacy has yet to take place.

In addition to literary works, the evidence include artworks, architecture, chapel designs, and the writings of the monarchs and influential court officials, including bishops, theologians, architects, and most importantly, the “propaganda” works themselves. I will establish links between Catholicism and Stuart England as these monarchs attempted to explain and enact their
views on Absolutism, whether as theoreticians or practitioners. Most historians have not accused
Charles of great intellect or strategic ability. But ample evidence demonstrates his conscious
choice of art, based on Catholic absolutist and religious artistic themes, to support his views of
the absolute state. The political and religious aspects of Absolutism cannot be separated. Vital to
the absolutist views of both James and Charles was a belief in their own unfettered power to
shape the Church in England (Scotland and Ireland as well) as God’s anointed monarchs. Their
prerogative as head of these churches was clearly expressed in the political works of James I.
This study also includes an examination of the religious polity that existed in the English Church
and the direction these monarchs envisioned for their churches. Neither James nor Charles was
content with the status quo. The Arminian movement enabled by James, and totally embraced by
Charles, was no less than an Arminian Counter-Reformation.

Moderate Calvinists and Puritans alike-deemphasized art, the beauty of worship, and
ceremonies during the Elizabethan Age. The initial part of James’s reign continued these same
policies. However, James changed this practice by the second decade of the seventeenth-century.
For Charles (and for James) the use of artworks and a renewed emphasis on ceremony veered
dangerously toward a reconnection to Roman Catholicism’s aesthetics and imagery. Image was
as important as Word. This tradition emphasized the visual arts in religion and politics as much
as the spoken and preached Word of God. Clearly, after the Reformation, most Protestants
emphasized a sermon-based piety. The novel and changing aesthetics of the Stuarts, anti-
Calvinists, and Arminians did not look to Protestant forms of worship for inspiration. They
looked to Catholicism’s past and it’s present.

The political and theological theories, expressed in Basilikon Doron, were extremely close
to the Catholic-based theory of government proposed in the Counter-Reformation by continental
thinkers.² This theory, recently called “anti-Machiavellianism,” suggests a direct response to the writings and practitioners of Machiavelli’s theory of princely rule. Recent scholarship connects some of these philosophers with the use of Baroque art.³ *Basilikon Doron,* along with the writings of the Catholic anti-Machiavellians, based merits of monarchy on traditional virtues connected with governing and the medieval political thought that centered governing on the Seven Cardinal Virtues. Many anti-Machiavellians taught that art was an ideal way to express the virtue of the prince for political consumption at court and beyond.

**Contentions about Absolutism**

During the last several decades revisionist authors have challenged the idea of Absolutism as a potent political theory in England. One recent work by Glenn Burgess, which ties most of the revisionist scholars’ works together, is *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution.*⁴

² Catholic philosophers, including Marc Antonio De Dominis and his publication *De republica seclesiastic,* and Justus Lipsius in his works *Two Books on Constancy* (1584) and *Political Advice and Examples* (1605), both advocated a strong and unified state as the way out of civil and religious chaos that was engulfing their world.

³ Irving Lavin, “Bernini’s Image of the Ideal Christian Monarch” in *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773,* Edited by John W. O’Malley, S. J., (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999) is one of the most recent articles written about the influence of anti-Machiavellianism in art. An entire school of thought exists on this subject by major scholars who are indebted to the writings of Friedrich Meinecke, *Machiavellianism: The Doctrine of Raison d’Etat and its Place in Modern History* (1927). Most important in this study is the work of Robert Bireley, *The Counter-Reformation Prince* (Raleigh, N. C., 1990), who sums up the main ideas and scholarship in this work, which supports the notion that during the Counter-Reformation many princes tried to change the then commonly held view of the corruption of monarchy and church by Protestant critics] by portraying the prince and prelate as noble, virtuous, anti-Machiavellian figures. Another important work is Mark Morford, *Stoics and Neostoics: Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991). The life and works of Lipsius are well known. His return to Catholicism and his continuation of Catholic themes meshed well with his devotion to the Christianization of Stoicism. The major study of Lipsius’s life is the subject of Morford’s work.

Although Absolutism is discussed in Chapter 4, it may be fruitful to outline the claims of Burgess and like-minded thinkers, as well as Johann Somerville, who provides the strongest scholarly defense of English Absolutism. Burgess’s main claim is that political Absolutism was rare in England during the time of the early Stuarts. As a follower of Conrad Russell, the most prominent revisionist historian, Burgess argued that there was no widespread adherence to the theory of an “absolute monarch” in pre-Civil War England.

These scholars maintained that Absolutism ran counter to the deep assumptions of English common law, and that only small groups of clerics, civil lawyers, and royal servants embraced this political notion. This claim is itself controversial. But Burgess’s statements about James’s position on Absolutism are more contentious. Burgess summed up the thought of authors, such as Christianson, Sharpe and Morell when he wrote, “Unfortunately James did not think this, [Absolutism] nor did most of his subjects. There is, indeed, so little absolutist in the political utterances of James I that it is only the supposed absolutism of his Scottish writings that justifies applying the label to him, presumably on the principle that old dogs don’t learn new tricks.”

Burgess aimed to rebut the claims of historians such as Somerville, who argued that a clear and ever divisive polarity existed between constitutionalist and absolutist accounts of political authority. Historians in this camp assumed that the ideological infrastructures of the civil wars of the 1640s were set up by two polarities, constitutionalism and Absolutism. Burgess argued that historians have fallen prey to this hermeneutic. By reexamining the language used in the early Stuart period, Burgess boldly stated that most historians have misunderstood the term “Divine Right of Kings,” as used by contemporary authors. As with Conrad and others, Burgess

5 Glenn Burgess, 43.
argued that the polemicists of the 1640s invented a conceptual opposition between absolutist and constitutionalist political authority, government, law, and kingship. Therefore, absolutist thought was not a cause of the Civil War, but a construct brought into being by the Civil War. Sommerville disagreed significantly with this conclusion.

Arguing against the efforts of Figgis and Sommerville, Burgess also attacked the *de jure divino* or divine law theories of monarchy as a source of English absolutist thought. For Burgess, such arguments were theories of “obligation” articulated against papist or radical Protestant resistance theorists rather than political imperatives. In Burgess’s view, Absolutism had no real “teeth,” even in the expressed thoughts of King James. Another supporter of this view is Nicholas Henshall, who recently argued that most European thinkers shared a consensus opinion that monarchy was not absolutist (free monarchy) but it was limited in some way by constitutionalism. Nevertheless, both authors saw the need for the term “absolutist” for those rare authors who argued that the king was above human law. Revisionists continue to argue that these rare period authors were not in step with political thought in England or on the continent.

Although Burgess’s conclusions have merit, his argument is ultimately unconvincing. A key question remains: Why and how did ideological disagreement and conflict happen if everyone “agreed” about politics and constitutionalism in early modern England before the Civil War? His other treatments are brief. His reflections on the religious conflicts that underpinned civil beliefs, and the political writings of James I, are sketched in five pages of text. Since the appearance Burgess’s book, the revision of English Absolutism has been continuously

---

challenged by Johann P. Sommerville, the champion of those who wish to retain some elements of Absolutism as a political force. Drawing on documents of the period, Sommerville argued that Absolutism in England was alive and vital in a more dynamic manner than described by Burgess, Sharpe, or Russell. Sommerville published works about James I’s writings, including examples of numerous primary sources that defended English Absolutism.7

Sommerville argued that English writers advanced political views identical to those published by continental theorists, most described as absolutists or as adherents of free monarchy. If continental thinkers were truly absolutists, he argued, then so were the numerous English writers he cited. At the center of Absolutism was the notion that when the sovereign commanded, unless he was contradicted by the direct injunctions of God, the subject was obliged to obey and could not resist. The king had the right to rule, free from constitutional restrictions, for the good of the kingdom. This was an inherent right in free monarchies.8 The king “used” the parliament to govern; the parliament did not use the king to govern.

Sommerville was particularly critical of Burgess’s notion that James was at heart a constitutionalist, and that apologists, such as Hobbes and Filmer, articulated the idea of Absolutism as a reaction to the English Civil War. Sommerville pointed out that James’s writings—including Basilikon Doron and The Trew Law of Free Monarchies—are clearly

---


responses to any who would limit the power of an absolute (free) sovereign, not just Papists and Puritans. After moving to England James did not change his rhetoric in later editions of these writings. Sommerville also documented sufficient examples of those who called for an absolutist theory before the Civil War, including Hobbes and Filmer, whose writings predated the conflicts. According to Sommerville, some of the scholarship included serious “slips on dates [which] are symptoms of rather more serious problems.”

It is important at the outset to decide which scholarly camp provides the most convincing argument. The issues raised by Sommerville seem sufficient to assume that James believed in his own theory. In general, I favor Sommerville’s position on Absolutism. James tried to gain further control of the country and the Church of England, though he rarely pushed his will upon his subjects unless he thought a dire consequence at stake. He did believe that there were constraints on tyranny. Tyranny, given his coronation oath to God to be a good King, was unchristian. However, he did nothing in his rule to support a notion of “devolving” his powers to the estates of his realms. The attitude of James was hardly one of providing more constitutional limitations for himself and his successors. If anything, he aimed to be independent. It is important to note that during his long reign, from 1603-1625, parliament met for only thirty-seven months. He convened parliaments when he needed money; he closed parliaments when

---

9 Johann P. Sommerville, ed., *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (2001: reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Throughout his introduction, Sommerville documents the notion of Absolutism in these important political works, especially the notion that the king had absolute authority over the church; these documents laid particular emphasis on final decisions on foreign and domestic policy by the king. This will be discussed in detail in subsequent chapters dealing with the influence of the *Basilikon Doron*.

they got out of control. That said, James’s Absolutism was moderate; he preferred to persuade or negotiate rather than command arbitrarily. Nevertheless, he insisted on his right to govern as a free monarch.

**Historiography: Political, Religious and Artist Research**

Authors in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries argued for a simple paradigm: Greedy self-serving monarchs, thirsty for power, struggled against the lofty ideals of fighters for religious freedom. The Whig narrative, like the followers of Weber and the Marx, tended to portray seventeenth-century England as a victorious battleground against Stuart tyranny. The result, predictably, was a progressive, modernizing, secularizing, and “truly Protestant” country. England materialized on its own, freed from the shackles of Catholic Europe through the power of its will and the “truth” of Protestantism. For the Whigs, this progression from “popery” and superstition through Protestant realism to a secular society largely ignores the vitality of early modern England and the influences that the continent had upon the island. As with these early scholars, historians focused much of their study on the causes and outcomes of the Civil War. Politics dominated the historiographical scene. For most of the last century, the debate was void of other causes for conflict in early modern England. This historical perspective has changed radically in the last few decades.

One of the classic Stuart scholars, G. M. Trevelyan, is a key representative of the earlier perspective. His work *England under the Stuarts*, first printed in 1904 and reprinted as late as 1985, is a case in point of early scholarship that directs the viewer to political pre-conceived conclusions: that revolution was inevitable, Stuart monarchs were failures, and that English Protestantism was destined to lead the world. Catholicism in these early works was dangerous to the march of English supremacy. It was in many ways irrelevant, ignoring the fact that James and Charles had Catholic queens and spent much political and artistic energy making their brand
of Protestantism more “appealing” to European Catholic culture. Above all, the Whigs offered a teleological narrative that assumed inevitable progress.

Social paradigms became the interpretive norm for those who rejected the “great man” theory of the Whigs. The chief characteristic of many works, produced from the 1940s through the early 1970s was an attempt to graft some sort of social dimension to the previous histories. Writers such as Lawrence Stone, who saw history through sociological perspective, or Christopher Hill, who looked to Marxism as a theory of history, added new data to the discussions. 11 But none of these studies offered a satisfactory conclusion to the debate of the causes of the Civil War. Tawney, Trevor-Roper, and Hexter, assumed that classes rising or falling were the major cause of troubles faced by Charles I. They largely ignore court culture.

Historians began to question the fruitfulness of Marxist and sociological approaches to the “social history” of politics. In the 1970s, revisionists searched for alternative ways to place politics into an appropriate cultural context. Their major assumption was that aristocratic ancient regime societies and politics had their own structures that proved irreducible to simplistic paradigms. Their attack on former historical works was leveled against anachronism and reductionism. Structural history was replaced with narrative; long-term social causation was replaced with short-term radical change. 12

11 See Lawrence Stone, The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641 (1965), Christopher Hill The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution (1972) for these viewpoints.

A sub-group of revisionist historians revived the possibility of a religious interpretation of the Civil War. The central claim was that the key factor in the collapse of the Stuart monarchy was religious discord. Revisionist historians reconsidered the social basis and the significance of radicalism in certain sectors of English society. Much of this radicalism centered on the godly elite, the Puritans. Previously, English revolutionaries were taken to be either anti-religious, secularizing libertarians, or strict constitutionalists. This perspective was displaced by the radically religious character of the period. Historians have found substantial evidence for interpreting the English Civil War and the collapse of the monarchy as religious conflict. J. C. Davis, Murray Tolmie, J. F. McGregor, and B. Reay are all authors who support the notion of radicalism within Protestantism in early modern England.13

The “religious war” model has clear advantages in studying the culture of this period. It poses a greater capacity to integrate the diverse phenomena of culture into one story. The notion of religious struggle allows for an overall context in which to deal with the art, practice, and ritual of the English Church, as well as church discipline, as important markers Englishmen used to choose sides during the conflict. This model also allows the introduction of Catholicism as an influence in the conflict. A key issue is that the religious war was fought not between Catholic and Protestant, but between two kinds of Protestantism. The victors were enemies of a Protestant state church.

Nicholas Tyacke argued the rise to prominence and preferment of the Arminian church party. He hypothesized that Calvinism was not seriously challenged in England until the ascension of James, who steadily preferred those of Arminian tastes to the episcopate and

important school positions. Andrewes, Laud, Wren, and others became potent preachers who argued for “a gospel of hope, in which salvation was the potential lot of everyone. . . .

[Arminianism] as it emerged in the 1630s was that of communal and ritualized worship rather than an individual response to preaching or Bible reading.”

His convincing thesis showed a remarkable shift that changed the near-Calvinist monopoly of the English Church by the time Archbishop Laud was appointed to Canterbury in 1633. Tyacke’s second argument was that the movement was not confined to the English Church but influenced Jacobean and Caroline churches in Ireland and Scotland. Here Tyacke noted the same process of replacing Calvinism with a rising “Arminian Imperialism” (Tyacke’s term). This was particularly evident in Scotland.

Arminians and anti-Calvinists both helped to initiate worship that appeared similar to traditional Catholic worship. It endorsed a glorious and beautiful liturgy, which was approved by Charles. The influence of the Arminians and their rejection by the neo-Calvinists (Tyacke’s term) of the 1630s and 40s fueled the demise of Charles’s monarchy. At the center of the debate between Arminians and Calvinists was free will and good works. As Tyacke wrote, “To the

---

14 Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 246. In his conclusion, Tyacke argued that the advancement of Arminians by James and then Charles meant that the altar, ceremony, sacraments, and enhancement of the priesthood was a challenge in the eyes of the “true Calvinists” who saw that the state of England and of her church seemed favorably inclined to the religion of the Papists.

15 Tyacke, 245-247.

16 Tyacke, 248.
extent that Popery was seen as synonymous with Arminianism, this was because the teaching on predestination by the Council of Trent was so similar.”

Other scholars who favor this religious component argued for foreign influence. W. B. Patterson noted the importance of exterior influence and religious détente as policy in Stuart England. Patterson made the case for a conscious effort by James to renew an ecumenical church in England and to connect the church to the broader European Christian community. As he wrote, “James was both a Protestant in the Calvinist tradition and an advocate of closer relations among all the churches, including the Roman Catholic Church.” Patterson noted that James believed that the “liturgy, polity, and doctrinal standards of the Church of England were in the historic Catholic tradition of Christianity. He therefore welcomed, even relished, religious discussions, and he worked toward the kind of organic unity, which he believed was the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church as described in the Apostles’ and Nicene creeds. Patterson portrayed James as a monarch who tried to reconcile Christianity. His research included key theologians and court figures who urged the king toward his vision of a more united Europe.

In a similar work, Anthony Milton surveys the vast field of work concerning the polity between the Church of England and its Protestant and Catholic roots. His conclusion is the most telling:

Previous divines had located the Church of England on the Protestant side of a polarized Christendom. The Laudians changed all this. Where previous writers had seen anti-popery as a positive form of religious expression and as a crucial means of vindicating


19 W. B. Patterson, 342.
the Protestant credential of the church’s hierarchy, Laudians considered anti-papery to be a destabilizing force, which prompted a false set of religious priorities and encouraged the growth of a puritan-style word-biased piety.”

This “puritan-style” would be a threat to the established order of the English Church as well as to absolute monarchy, especially to Puritans who did not welcome royal interference in matters of personal faith. Milton suggested a conscious effort by church and crown to move closer to the Roman Church for political and “aesthetic” reasons. The Crown admired the discipline, order, and the sumptuous worship of the Tridentine church. It admired its visual nature, something revived in the current masques of the day. That said, Milton did not examine specific artworks or chapel designs. An analysis of this changing aesthetic will be a central contribution of this study.

In *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, Kevin Sharpe examined various aspects of royal life, including the impact of the visual arts and literature. It is one of the most detailed reappraisals of the peacetime years of the reign of Charles I. In several respects, however, Sharpe’s research contains contradictory implications. While claiming that Catholicism and its culture were not welcomed in England by Charles, Sharpe pointed out how well ambassadors from the great Catholic powers, papal envoys, and the queen’s household were received and how they were granted free worship and movement. Sharpe also failed to acknowledge the considerable influence of Catholic Baroque culture and iconography on Charles, as well as his choice of artists and their visual use of cultural themes.

---


Sharpe also ignored the influence of Catholic art and piety on the Church of England, particularly as its polity moved toward order, ceremony, and the beauty of worship. It is no coincidence that the queens of England were Catholic at exactly the time Arminian bishops, as well as the monarchy, began to commission traditional artworks not seen since the days of Mary Tudor.22 “The High mass of Neo-platonic monarchy performed by the whole clerisy of court”23 came into existence in the late 1620s and early 30s. It was the time of Stuart reliance on the arts, the time proclaiming their view of Absolutism. The mystery of monarchy was to be seen, heard, and experienced.

Catholic connections to culture were also noted in the work of Caroline M. Hibbard. Seeking to bring Catholic studies out of the shadows of English historiography, Hibbard saw her task as integrating the role of political anti-popery from 1637-1642 and connecting it to court Catholicism.24 Hibbard’s study, however, was too narrow thematically to include the cultural connections and importance of Catholics. Hibbard noted that the court was highly visible in London and that the “strength and visibility of London and court Catholicism should not,

22 Margaret Aston, one of the most reliable scholars of the 16th century, notes that it is Mary Tudor who restored painting and sculpture in England after the iconoclastic policies of Edward VI (in Margaret Aston, England’s Iconoclasts: Laws against Images, Volume I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988). Mary encouraged the replacement of altars and the artwork that was destroyed. Mary restored St. George, one of the most often venerated non-biblical saints, especially by the royal family, who was often a subject in art for both Tudors and Stuarts after Edward suppressed his association with the Knights of the Garter. See Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth-century (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), 108-109.


therefore, be written off as anomalous and thus insignificant.”25 The influence of Catholicism was magnified through the communications networks originating in London and exchanged back and forth to the counties. She also noted that English historians of this period rarely addressed the importance of Catholicism given their ignorance of Catholic history and Catholic sources.26

**Cultural Histories**

A more holistic attempt to engage other disciplines, notably literary and art historians, is increasingly more prevalent in Stuart studies. Roy Strong, one of the groundbreaking interdisciplinary historians, stressed the importance of art for its political and religious ramifications. His works rely heavily on literary concerns, which explore a pan-European use of masques and spectacle begun in the late Middle Ages throughout the key kingdoms of Western Europe.27 Illustrative of his approach is the Chapter entitled “The Illusions of Absolutism: Charles I and the Stuart Court Masques” which was dedicated to the importance of the literary culture of the Caroline court. Strong emphasized the self-fashioning of monarchs. He wrote “in a Europe dominated by the problem of rival religious creeds and the breakdown of the Universal Church, the monarch not only established himself as the arbiter in religious matters but gradually became adulated as the sole guarantor of peace and order within the state.”28 He noted that Charles portrayed himself as a virtuous absolute monarch in quasi-religious works. These works

---

25 Caroline Hibbard, 5.

26 Caroline Hibbard, 5.


28 Roy C. Strong, 19.
were central to understanding the monarchy and the age. Strong also argues for the “Englishness” of what was created in the early 1600s. I will present evidence that these works were not so clearly “English.”

As with Strong, Stephen Orgel contributed to the use of literary sources for understanding early modern England. He examined literary contributors of the period by offering detailed studies of Jonson, Milton, and Donne in relation to the early Stuarts. For instance, Orgel examines masques of the Jacobean and Caroline period to examine politics and the “propaganda” of Absolutism in the masques. Orgel and Strong offer a collaboration of disciplines in their work that emphasized the importance of Inigo Jones as a figure who straddled the visual and literary world. Jones was the architect, not only of court masques, but also of the Banqueting House at Whitehall. This building was a major dynastic statement intended to evoke religious, political, and imperial imagery. Shaped as a Roman Basilica, Strong suggests its imperial connections, though he fails to note that the Basilica was used for Christian churches from the time of Constantine, and indeed, that the cruciform church was simply two basilicas set at a crossing. This religious connection was part of the intention of the Banqueting House, especially after it was fitted with the works of Rubens.

29 Roy C. Strong. This notion is seen throughout his chapter, “A Royalist Arcadia: Charles I” in Splendor at Court, however he does not make the connection with Catholic iconography or use in church art or architecture. I will treat this area in my analysis of the artistic record.


In their research into the Stuart masques, Orgel and Strong were pioneers in noting the importance of Queen Anne and the influence of a French consort. In particular, both authors acknowledge Henrietta Maria’s ever-pervasive attachment to her freely practiced Catholic faith; both authors stop short, however, in investigating her influence on her husband (Charles I) and on the court. Until recently, the influence of Henrietta Maria has been systematically underestimated. The same can be said of the historiography concerning Queen Anne of Denmark, also Catholic, but much more reserved in the practice of her faith.

Following in the tradition of Orgel and Strong, Jonathan Goldberg introduced new ways of adducing the political significance of aesthetic structures at court. Goldberg argued that a political theology and iconography permeated early seventeenth century literature. Goldberg chose texts that cut across genres. He may well be the first author to take seriously the talent of James I as a poet. Goldberg pointed out in the prefatory sonnet to the Basilikon Doron that “in it, absolute and free, James indicates what the style of gods [kings] meant: the claim to total freedom in the reshaping of discourse to proclaim power.”32 Goldberg argues throughout that James was a conscious shaper of the arts.

Kevin Sharpe illustrates movement toward court culture as a vehicle for broader historical understanding.33 Sharpe’s more recent work analyzed Caroline court culture, that is, the arts and letters associated with the ascending and ruling classes. Sharpe, though not the first to do so, stressed the influence of neoplatonic love at the court of Charles I. He claimed it was

---


the central philosophy that united Caroline culture.34 Through the study of three neglected poets of the Caroline period, Thomas Carew, Aurelian Townsend, and William Davenant, Sharpe has an historian’s grasp of the political nature of these works. The arts inform us much about the ideas and values of Renaissance courts as they inform us about aesthetics or tastes expressed at court.

R. Malcolm Smuts examines a broad range of topics dealing with court culture. Smuts’ assessment includes the examination of what he calls a “haphazard” approach to culture by the early Stuarts. One of his major theses is that “we cannot trace the continuous development of a unified tradition. Instead, we will need to examine a number of loosely related cultural trends, not only within the court but in London and on the continent, which coalesced into a reasonably cohesive culture only in the 1620s and 1630s.”35 He concluded that the culture of the Stuarts failed to support the monarchy because it was haphazardly marketed to the broader audience.36 I will make a case that failure to achieve a program was not so much the marketing or design of the Stuart court as in the difficulty of unifying three countries representing vastly different forms of religious and political belief during a time of religious conflict that engaged most of western Europe. This failure was exacerbated by the lack of a cohesive English Church settlement. Charles and Laud tried to create a cohesive church in the 1630s, but the Arminian Counter-Reformation was cut short because of religious troubles in Ireland and Scotland; this left the always cash-strapped Stuart regime weakened and their Counter-Reformation unfinished.

34 Kevin Sharpe, 22-23.

35 Kevin Sharpe, 7.

Smuts noted the “pervasive influence at court of Roman Catholic tastes and attitudes.”

He explained the tolerance for Catholicism at Charles’s court by reminding the reader that “stereotypes created by generations of conflict could not easily survive in an environment where people of different religions routinely socialized and intrigued together.” However, he does not address how the regime used art or why the greatest collector in English Royal history labored to expand his collections and commissions. Smuts continues to view Charles as an inept ruler and haphazard collector. In emphasizing the rise of the Arminians and anti-Calvinists, he wrote:

The attraction that Catholic forms of worship held for the king and many of his courtiers also stemmed from more deeply rooted causes. The pronounced aesthetic sensitivity of the court, its fascination with ritualistic modes of thought and behavior, fostered receptivity to the splendor of the Roman church and distaste for Puritan austerity. Both kings and Laud believed that visible expressions of piety created an essential atmosphere of reverence.

According to Smuts’ argument, all these forces united to shift the balance toward a Roman position. Though Smuts makes general claims, he fails to connect his argument with specific artworks. One of the most important contributions of the present study will be to provide fresh
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37 R. Malcolm Smuts, Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 225. Smuts argued as evidence that Catholics were treated more kindly for political reasons as well as the fact that the Caroline court tastes were more like that of the Roman church than the puritan austerity of the Elizabethan Age (224-228). He also presented those who derided the new taste, especially Prynne, who was one of the most vocal critics of Laud (227-228) because of his “popish” ceremonialism. Henrietta Maria gathered by 1637 a significant Catholic party around her and the papal envoy Gorge Con. This appeared to be extremely threatening to those who saw the Reformation slipping away, according to Smuts (219-222).

38 R. Malcolm Smuts, 227.

examples of artworks that demonstrate a self-conscious program of collection and commission by the early Stuarts.

Roger Lockyer offers several useful examples of Catholic influence on court culture during the Stuart period. Concerning the influence of Henrietta Maria, he wrote, “Henrietta Maria was not simply a devout Catholic. She had also been taught to regard herself as the agent through whom first her husband and then his kingdom would be returned to the papal fold.”

Lockyer points out that Henrietta Maria’s entourage included musicians, artisans, and a bishop as her chaplain. “She brought back to London, for the first time since Mary Tudor’s reign, the richness of traditional Catholic worship, with its entire musical and visual splendor.”

Erica Veevers also emphasizes the importance of Henrietta Maria, particularly the queen’s influence on the court of Charles I. Veevers goes so far as to lament the lack of attention paid to her. “In discussions of Henrietta’s influence on literature, moreover, scarcely any attention has been paid to her Catholicism. If mentioned at all, it tends to be treated as an unfortunate aspect of her character that hastened Charles’s downfall.” Veevers maintained that the study of Henrietta Maria was essential to understand the confusion perceived by the regime’s opponents in connection with Charles’s developing religious tastes. A fresh look at her influence is imperative, including her influence in religion and the politics of art.

---


41 Roger Lockyer, 279.

42 Roger Lockyer, 279.
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An example of the growth of the interdisciplinary approach is a collection of essays edited by Linda Levy Peck. Peck argued for study that is more intertextual because James presented a new type of English monarch, very different from the three Tudors following Henry VIII. The monarch now was a publisher of his own thoughts. He shaped his world directly by his writings and personal intervention in court culture. I would add that Charles I was a new type of monarch in his emphasis on the creation of fine arts, otherwise unseen since Henry VIII. As his father shaped culture through the Word, Charles shaped culture through the Image.

One of the recent contributions to the dialogue of Stuart historiography is David Howarth, who focused on the politics of art among the Tudors and early Stuarts. Unfortunately, Howarth rarely mentions the influence of Catholic iconography and religious artwork in England. Although he continues many themes identified by others authors, Howarth dealt briefly with the topic of Catholic influence on the English Church and state. He mentioned that Catholic art forms were “adapted” to bolster the rule of Elizabeth, and later James and Charles. As with others, Howarth neglected Catholic influence, judged outside his topic. These historians rarely ask a key question: If pre-reformed iconography had been transformed so successfully, why then did its use cause such vehement reaction in the 1640s? Why was it so misinterpreted?

The transformation was not so successful. John Peacock claimed that Charles was an “energetic and thoughtful monarch.” Through artwork, as well as literary culture, Charles sustained an effort for almost twenty years to convince country and court, the truth of

45 Linda Levy Peck, *Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 39. These essays derive from a conference at the Folger Library, involving experts in history, literature, and art history to address issues of “mentality” at the Jacobean court.
Absolutism and his religious view. His efforts took much energy and thought. He used the Catholic artist Van Dyck, the supreme pupil of the greatest Baroque painter, Rubens, to shape his image as a demigod. Van Dyck portrayed Charles as an earthly king with a type of spiritual power. As Howarth noted: “The idea that the ability of such a high order as Van Dyck’s was a kind of power intrinsic to the Italian renaissance tradition which had been chosen by the artist as the context of his ambitions, and by the King as the medium of his cultural policy.”

Although these works appear decorative, they were primarily didactic. Charles was always teaching.

Charles used Italianate portraiture and a collection of Italian artists, such as Titian, Tintoretto, Caravaggio, and Guido Reni, in a spectacular series of paintings in St. James’s Palace. Their purpose was to impress the court officials, ambassadors, and visiting royalty. These works, specifically Titian’s portraits of the twelve Caesars, along with Giulio Romano’s portraits of them on horseback, were used as a foil for Van Dyck’s portrait of Charles on horseback. In this display, Charles was a direct inheritor to the Roman and Constantinian imperial tradition. “The spectator was impelled to see Charles as the imperial heir of the Caesars, and Van Dyck as the heir of the great Italian masters. This was the king, and this the painter, that history had been waiting for.” However, these were not initial ideas of Charles. The king of Spain displayed years before in Madrid such a collection of works in the same way for the same reason. Charles saw this display, he learned and emulated.

Many historians have assumed that the Stuart court was closed. But as Lockyer writes, “Old assumptions about the closed nature of the Stuart court are being replaced with a more...

---


47 John Peacock, 226.
informed notion of access.”⁴⁸ Openness at court was important for Stuart monarchs to propagate their view of rule and to teach through court ceremonies, artworks, religious policies, and public venues. Recent authors such as Lockyer, argue that the assumption that Charles cut himself off from the English people is overstated. In fact there were opportunities for non-aristocrats to see the “spectacle of the court or to visit houses containing art.”⁴⁹ In a recent article, Tim Wilks maintained that authors have identified expressions of admiration for art during the Stuart period and fewer complaints about art than previously believed. “All this suggests that the display of art succeeded, on the whole, in gratifying the many onlookers.”⁵⁰

Graham Parry’s most recent work argues for a concerted effort to shape culture by Charles and his divines. Parry successfully incorporates art history with sermons, devotional prose, church music, and architecture to describe the Arminian or anti-Calvinist movement as a Protestant Counter-Reformation.⁵¹ Though he allowed for some influence for this movement from Catholic sources, Parry remained unwilling to acknowledge Catholic Counter-Reformation culture as a significant force in England. With this said, Parry is an important scholar who has rightly emphasized the break between the Stuart and Tudor monarchies, though the importance of Catholic sources for this counter-reform remain understated.


⁴⁹ Roger Lockyer, 188.


Structure of This Study

The present study follows the tradition of recent cultural histories. The perspective, perhaps most similar to that of David Howarth, aims to expand cultural history to give still greater weight to religion and art. In the course of this study, I address questions that have been ignored or only partially addressed by earlier authors. For example, was there significant Catholic influence in Stuart England? Did the Stuarts intentionally emulate the great Catholic monarchies in their display and commission of artwork or was it “haphazard”? Was Catholic iconography present in these “Protestant” political works about Absolutism? How important were Catholics in early modern England, especially the Stuart queens and members of court? Did Catholicism, (real or imagined by the detractors of the Stuarts), play a greater role in the demise of Charles?

In Chapter 2, Catholic Absolutist Art and Architecture in Italy and the Hapsburg Dominions from 1580 through 1640: a Model for Early Modern England, I provide a comprehensive study of Catholic iconography after the Council of Trent (1545-1563) and its effect on Absolutist art. One important objective is defining “absolutist” within the Catholic matrix, and the views of the adherents of this political idea who were identified with the Roman Church. This study therefore includes an examination of the artistic and architectural themes of the courts of Spain, the papacy, and other proponents of this theory of divine rulership. Particular attention is given to the traditional religious, historical, and dynastic themes in art that demonstrate Absolutism. Important documents, such as the Council of Trent, the writings of commentators about church construction and decoration such as Charles Borromeo’s
Instructiones Fabricate et Supellectilis Ecclesiasticae, and Gabriele Paleotti’s, De sacris et profanes imaginibus libri V, are included as evidence of the artistic context of Catholicism that embraced a “Culture of Image.”

The artworks produced from the middle of the sixteenth century by Catholic courts demonstrated the rebirth of absolutist images among Catholics, particularly by the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, his son Philip II of Spain (formerly king of England as well), and the early Baroque papacy. Most historians have concluded that Charles V revived the notion of Absolutism. He also reinvigorated the iconographical vocabulary of the divine right of kings. It is important to note not a single volume has been dedicated to the specific topic of absolutist art.

As Chapter 2 addresses the Catholic aesthetic for the use of political and religious art, Chapter 3, The Changing Protestant Aesthetic: English Protestant Trends and Traditions in Religious art, Iconoclasm, Portraiture, Tomb Sculpture and Collection from 1560-1620, discusses English Protestant aesthetic(s) and ideology by focusing on the reign of Elizabeth I and the early reign of James I. This change was exemplified in James’s most important early statement, the memorial sculptural tomb made for Mary Queen of Scots in Westminster Abbey (Figures 1-1, 1-2, 1-3), a monument underappreciated as an example of Stuart absolutist or

---

52 Evelyn Carole Voelker, “Charles Borromeo’s Instructiones Fabricae Et Supellectilis Ecclesiasticae, 1577. A Translation with Commentary and Analysis” (PhD diss., Syracuse University, 1977). Evelyn Voelker is the first to translate this work from the original 1577 manuscript of Borromeo into English and all references to this document will be from her translation. Instructiones was reprinted many times in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century in Italian, French and Latin.

This chapter notes the significant influence of John Calvin on tomb art and architecture, and the absence of Christian symbolism. This chapter gives evidence of an “evolution” toward the use of more religiously-themed art that would shape their vision of monarchy and the English Church. Image was integral to the Stuart strategy of shaping an Absolutist state.  

Chapter 4, *James I: Virtue, Art and Politics in Early Stuart England*, analyzes religious and artistic shifts in absolutist imagery in the reign of James I. A principal focus is the political thought of James as reflected in the *Basilikon Doron*. Charles was significantly influenced by his father’s ideology. Also of significant interest are continental political thinkers who supported Absolutism, notably the Catholic anti-Machiavellians. They are discussed to illustrate similar views of Absolutism. Chapter 4 ends with an examination of James’s changing attitude toward adoption of more traditional Catholic iconography. This is demonstrated through the renovations of Protestant chapels, the building of Catholic chapels, the Banqueting House, and the planned dramatic renovations of St. Paul’s.

The major focus of Chapter 5, *Art and Catholic Influence: The Early Years of Charles I*, describes influences on Charles I before his ascension to the English, Scottish, and Irish thrones. Included in Chapter 5 I will discuss key individuals who helped to shape his artistic choices, among them Charles’s older brother Henry, who was a brilliant but short-lived luminary who commissioned much art, and Queen Anne, a grand collector. Charles inherited both collections upon their deaths; he also inherited their attitudes about the display of art. Chapter 5 continues

---

54 The notion found in the *Basilikon Doron* and other writings of James I, discussed in Chapter 3 are that the King could shift the church’s polity in any direction as God’s personal representative. This will be explored in depth.
with discussion of Charles’s travel to the courts of France, and Spain, Particularly the brilliant atmosphere that had been created by Catharine d’ Medici that opened his eyes the Baroque religious art. Stuart scholars underestimate this “expedition”. The nature of the Spanish court and philosophers from the Low Countries, ruled by Spain, were among the most energetic proponents of Absolutism. Hapsburg artistic wonders had considerable influence in the movement toward the use of Catholic iconography, and the significant return of religious art for display in the English court in the 1620s.

Chapter 6, *The Movement Toward Catholic Art and Iconography in the Early Reign of Charles I*, is a discussion of the extensive artistic output and collecting during the reign of Charles I. His patronage added a dynamic current that ultimately revolutionized artistic tastes in England. Charles presided over an unprecedented flourishing of the arts not seen since Henry VIII. This chapter examines the most important artworks commissioned by Charles, which use Catholic imagery. Among these, the Banqueting House, which anchored the dynasty to traditional Biblical art and the classical world of Roman emperors (an important theme expressed by Charles Borromeo and Gabriele Paleotti), and its decorative cycle by Peter Paul Rubens. Analysis is presented that these works contain Catholic Counter-Reformation iconography.

Relative silence on the issue of Protestant values in such commissions was their similarity to Catholic works from the Counter-Reformation. The general peace established by James allowed a large number of the British elite and merchant classes to scrutinize these artworks for the first time. Chapter 6 provides evidence that one of the long-term assumptions, that Inigo Jones was the master designer of the ceiling paintings of the Banqueting House, may not be accurate. The paintings are likely a collaboration of Rubens and Charles. Finally, this chapter underscores the importance of the renovations of St. Paul’s Cathedral. Having
languished during the reign of Elizabeth I, St. Paul’s was in dire need of repair. James I began to make this a key project toward the end of his reign. The choice of classical/Baroque architecture for the exterior of the old cathedral, and the controversial decoration of the façade, is a key monument of Catholic influence. The re-constructed porticoes at the main entrances connect Charles to the Solomonic legend of the “great builder king.” St. Paul’s recalled the façades of many Catholic churches while adding an ecumenical flavor.

Art as Absolutist instruction is the central theme of Chapter 7, *Catholic Influence and Iconography in Absolutist Art in Caroline England*. Bernini’s talents are examined in the context of the famous bust created for Charles, commissioned as a present to him by Henrietta Maria. Irving Lavin sees this type of bust as a prime example of Catholic anti-Machiavellian artworks proclaiming the right to rule. This commission demonstrates the closeness of the English regime and the papacy of the 1630s. Charles’s most noted artist, Van Dyck, painted a triptych portrait as Bernini’s inspiration; this bust was considered one of the best that Bernini completed (it was a sensation in Rome and London) and was done as an example of the developing anti-Machiavellian style made popular by Bernini. This chapter documents the influences of Queen Henrietta Maria on her husband, as well as a concerted effort to use sculpture in promoting Absolutism.

The final chapter, Chapter 8, is an Epilogue and Conclusion. Here the attitudes of court Catholics are examined along with their attempts to make themselves appealing to the regime. The consequences of the early Stuart absolutist program, its filtrations with Catholicism, and the dispersal and ritualistic destruction of Catholic art are examined as final symbolic gestures. This Epilogue provides a general conclusion to this study.
Figure 1-1. William and Cornelius Cure. *Tomb of Mary Queen of Scots*, 1612. Westminster Abby. Photo by author.
Figure 1-2. (Detail of Angels) *Tomb of Mary Queen of Scots*. Photo by author.

Figure 1-3. *Tomb of Mary Queen of Scots*. Detail of Christian Iconography showing the Chi Ro and the Cross-prominently displayed along with Palm branches, which suggest that Mary was a Martyr. Photo by author.
Historians agree that Rome was the epicenter of the restoration of the Catholic Church. The pope emerged with renewed claims for a universal jurisdiction after the Council of Trent (1545-1563), thereafter-leaving matters of church doctrine officially in the hands of the pope. Late Mannerist and Baroque artworks were used successfully by popes, such as Sixtus V, Paul V, and Clement VIII to shore up the papal position as political heads of state and spiritual sovereigns; indeed, “Rome was unquestionably the theater for the development of Baroque art, and essential to this development was the patronage of the Papal Court.”

Spanish influences were also important on Stuart England. Spain was the major foreign court, and Charles I spent a significant amount of time pursuing the “Spanish match.” Though his mission eventually failed, James I spent years trying to marry his eldest son to an Italian and subsequently to a Spanish princess. After the death of Prince Henry in 1612, James continued his matchmaking efforts until 1624, hoping to arrange the marriage of Prince Charles to the Infanta of Spain in a futile effort to bridge the gap of warring communions.

Charles was influenced by the magnificence of the architecture of the Spanish court, its churches, and the Spanish Hapsburg tradition of displaying fine art. It is also significant that the two most important artists working for the Stuarts—Rubens and Van Dyck—were from the Spanish Netherlands. Rubens was not only an artist but also a trusted ambassador for both courts. Charles was ripe for influence. No Protestant prince of his time displayed and cherished

---

art as did Charles Stuart. His position as head of state and head of church was problematic; he was the head of a church that was theologically Calvinist.

The English Church continued to struggle to find a place for the use of art that would “fit” Calvinist beliefs for the use of visual arts (the topic of Chapter 3).\(^2\) The art Charles collected and commissioned was centered in the notions of divine right, princely virtue, and religious piety. So, too, was the art of southern princes who espoused the theory of the divine right of kings. At the center of Catholic absolutist art is the notion of the “Virtues” of the ruler through ancestry, deeds and religious observance. It is through this absolutist art that the prince proclaimed his right to rule as God’s chosen. Though Absolutism taught that divine right was automatically conferred at birth, the princes of the early modern period used their reputations as a way to show their elected positions. Rulers expected obedience because God chose them and because they were men of virtue. Catholicism paved the way for this artistic vocabulary.

**Catholic Rulership: The Art of Virtue**

At the center of the art produced for and by Catholic monarchs during the latter third of the sixteenth-century was an art to extol virtue, clarity, storytelling, and classicism. The legends that gave rise to the concept of the virtuous, faithful, Christian prince were an antidote to the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli, who severely questioned that traditional virtues were always useful for the ruler. The ideal ruler Machiavelli described in *The Prince* was at times ruthless, at times

\(^2\) James I taught the notion of a virtuous absolutist monarchy, expressed through his writings and others literature, and through masques, which were less “threatening” to Calvinist doctrine. I propose throughout this study that Charles I tried to “argue” for the same virtuous divine monarchy not through words, but through the collection, display, and creation of the visual culture of his day. Those who professed to be truly orthodox Calvinists would find it difficult to accept the use of art as a political or religious tool. The intertwining of politics and religion are essential features of this study in that England was a monarchy with a state church where the monarch was head of both church and state.
faithless, and to be feared rather than loved. This challenged the notions of Christian rule and society. Often detractors of monarchs accused them of this Machiavellian program. Therefore, princes in the Catholic south began to respond to such criticism with vast propaganda works in paint and stone. These works extolled their faith, prudence, justice, and lineage in attempts to shore up their position as rulers.

In response to Machiavelli’s writings and the religious conflicts in Europe after the Reformation, the search for virtuous rule and stability was renewed. Absolutism addressed both of these problems. This quest for “virtuous rule” was steeped in the traditional notions about virtue, rooted in Greek thought and the writings of the Catholic and Orthodox Septuagint, especially in the Book of Wisdom and Solomon’s writings. The four cardinal virtues of prudence, temperance, fortitude, and justice were initially provided by Plato, but were later adapted by Saints Ambrose, Augustine of Hippo, and Thomas Aquinas. The cardinal virtues were deemed especially indicative of a sign of good rule.

The three Theological Virtues of faith, hope and charity (or love) are found in Chapter 28 of Genesis, where Jacob describes his vision of a ladder or stairway leading to heaven. Saint Paul mentions these in Chapter 13 of First Corinthians, clearly reminding his readers of their connection to these ancient concepts: And now these three remain: faith, hope and love. But the greatest of these is love.

From the time of emperor Charles V, much writing, artwork, and architecture was devoted to tying individual rulers to all seven virtues in an attempt to shore up their right to rule as God’s chosen lieutenants. James I in Basilikon Doron uses some form of “virtue” 70 times.3 Rulers

---

3 I have counted this myself. This does not include references to specific virtues like temperance, love, etc. In this document, James was obsessed with the notion that he and his
were obsessed with the promotion of virtue and with leaving a legacy of honorable rulership as expressed in *Basilikon Doron*.

At the center of a renewal itself, the Catholic Church, through the Council of Trent, challenged the pope to virtue. It also called for the things of heaven to be expressed in paint, print, and stone. Largely, late Mannerist and early Baroque art surpassed the creations of the early and high Renaissance in this search for “virtue,” truth, and an immediate grasp of “meaning” for the viewer. The Baroque fundamentally sought clarity in storytelling. It was an art of exuberance, of excess, and fit for propaganda. The Baroque aimed to surpass both of the previous styles of the High Renaissance and Mannerism in its ability to communicate emotion and evoke the faithful to follow the lead of saints and princes. Above all, its style had the potential to express the right of the virtuous Catholic prince to rule as a divine agent of God, especially the greatest of these princes, the pope. This art embraced the past, as well as legends, to further the Church’s beliefs and politics and the politics of individual rulers.

**Reemergence of Rome as a Spiritual and Artist Center**

In the years immediately after 1527, one would not have seen any prospect that Rome would again become an artistic or a political capital of the Western world or much less the center of a Universal Catholic Church. Yet Rome re-emerged even stronger than before the Reformation after the Council of Trent. A number of able and strong popes such as Sixtus V at the end of the sixteenth-century and Paul V at the beginning of the seventeenth-century, took firm control of the church and implemented the teachings of the Council of Trent. The Church successors be seen as virtuous princes with absolute powers. This will be a major discussion in Chapter 3 of this study.

---

fought back the Reformation by reforming itself and in many cases reversing some of the gains made by Protestantism. “The mood of confident defiance that animated the council was better expressed by the majestic Christ of Michelangelo’s Last Judgment (A-1), completed shortly before it opened, than by any work from the latter part of the sixteenth-century. This was not because the council had been iconoclastic, as had some of the Protestants. It had not sought, as they had, to banish paintings or statues of Christ or the saints from churches.”

Michelangelo’s Last Judgment (A-1) is a prime example of virtue and of the punishment of vice on a monumental scale at the heart of the papacy itself, the Sistine Chapel. Although the Last Judgment included the Mannerist tendencies of nudity and some of its compositional structure, this work is a hopeful expression of God’s mercy on the church. Despite its magnificence, the Last Judgment needed “repair” in the eyes of the post-Tridentine church because of excessive nudity. Baroque art was to abandon the sensuousness of the Last Judgment and of the late Renaissance and Mannerist styles to exhibit messages of propriety and high merit.

This new vision of art was that it would show the desirable quality of great religious truths rather than serve as conversation pieces for the artistic elect, which Mannerist art had become. Art and architecture emerged showing an appropriate use of the human figure, spiritual

---

5 Madeleine Mainstone and Roland Mainstone, 2.

6 Some art historians see this work as a proto-Baroque work, such as Robert Westin, professor of art and art history at the University of Florida (office discussions, fall 2007). This work is difficult to classify, as it has elements of Renaissance, Mannerism, and what would be called the Baroque 40 years after its production.

7 Note that two-thirds of the painting is filled with those already resurrected and in heaven or those rising to good judgment, while the other third, destined for hell, are on the viewer’s right. This is a fact that is not often noted by historians or art historians.
emotionalism, and yet rationality. This change in aesthetics provided a perfect vehicle to show religious and political ideology. This was in contrast to the theology of some of the reformers who rejected Image. Art was not abandoned or made neutral, it now more central than ever in religious and political propaganda in Catholic lands.

**Effects of the Council of Trent**

Part of the function of late Mannerist and early Baroque art can be seen in the analysis of Spanish art historian A. C. Pellicer, who characterized this period as the art of becoming.

“Things are but the expression of ideas, [in contrast] to the classic mentality which saw in ideas the expression of things.”

In other words, ideology was made present and existent through plays, art, statuary, and so forth. One point that the Roman church wanted to express after the Council of Trent was its viability and legitimacy.

The Church fought back by reforming itself. Some of the initiative was taken by saintly and highly competent individuals—like St. Ignatius who founded the influential missionary and teaching Society of Jesus, St. Francis Xavier who was an early member of the Society and a missionary in the east, St. Philip Neri who founded the Orations and St. Theresa who reformed the Carmelite order.

The Baroque artist found inspiration in these men and women whose actions served the church so well that they acquired sainthood soon after their deaths. The artist drew insight from their writings. But the most important development for the church was the clear statement of faith and purpose found in the Council of Trent, which was responsible for renewed confidence in the papacy. This renewed confidence included recovery of lands and entire states that had

---


9 Madeleine Mainstone and Rowland Mainstone, 2.
become Protestant. The Council of Trent mandated superior education for clergy and the use of appropriate art as a tool of Christianity. Catholicism was energized and on the move once again.

This newfound confidence was buoyed by a renewed use of art to explain the position of the church, and it indirectly influenced the claims of absolutists’ theories about the state of Christian government. After a string of mediocre and impotent popes during and after the Reformation, popes such as Sixtus V, Paul V, and Urban VIII became some of the greatest patrons of art and architecture of all time, and art became one of this period’s most important tools. These popes combined religious ideology with their claim of absolute and universal jurisdiction. The Baroque style, which emerged from Trent and the later writings of fathers of the council, was effective through clarity, exuberance, the positive character of artwork, and a vocabulary of classical ideals, and a standardized religious iconography. Pontiffs, by embracing this new style, re-made Rome into the cultural center of the West. The strategy of using art to defend Rome’s prestige continued for more than one hundred years, with its high point coming in the twenty-one year pontificate of Urban VIII (1623-44).

The new art called for by the Council of Trent was a response to the criticism by Protestants and Catholics alike regarding the lack of virtue in the culture of the Renaissance. Early reformers had attacked the church for being “Machiavellian” in its lack of morals and for a religious doctrine, which seemed to support the spiritual and resultant financial bilking of the poor for remodeling projects such as the new St. Peter’s, along with the luxuriant lifestyles of the papal curia. This lack of virtue and the corruption of the hierarchy was the initial problem identified in the church by Erasmus (who remained Catholic), then by Luther and Calvin.

Another basic criticism by the early reformers--and one that was to continue in the Reformed mindset--was the distrust of church authority and the preference for personal
autonomy concerning the individual believer’s access to God. This led to a characteristic of the corporate in Catholicism versus the private in particularly Calvinistic Protestantism. Rather than shifting toward the idea of personal autonomy, the Council of Trent’s response was not to weaken hierarchy by replacing or limiting its power, as suggested by the reformers, but to call for virtuous reforms of the Catholic hierarchy itself and to enhance its importance in church structure. This also meant an enhancement in the role of the papacy and its role as overseer of bishops. Bishops were essential for Tridentine Catholicism. Forty years after the closing of Trent, bishops would be just as essential for James and Charles, who supported the role of bishops in their particular brand of hierarchal Protestantism. As in Catholicism, these English Protestant bishops were to be a vital link in shoring up the monarchy, just as the role of the Catholic bishops was to shore up papal authority throughout the world.

With the Council of Trent’s redefinition of increased papal authority within the church came a new definition of increased interest in an art tailored for the Catholic resurgence. Trent promulgated changes in liturgical practice that created a more splendid mass fit for the total belief in Christ’s presence in the mystery of transubstantiation, upheld and defended at Trent. The sacraments, churches, oratories, and so forth were to be glorified, as well as God’s lieutenants—the bishops and in particular the pontiff. Ironically, almost sixty years after Trent, the monarchy and the majority of the bishops of the English Church would come to a very similar “Counter-Reformation” sensibility about art and religious authority in England; some historians have suggested they came to this on their own. This seems unlikely.

Trent was convened in three sessions over an eighteen-year period from 1545 to 1563. The decrees for which the Council of Trent argued in its plenary sessions were for liturgical and ecclesiastical reform, an end to abuses and a return to the principles of the early church (a theme
often reflected in the writings of James and his bishops), a program with which Rome and the
Protestants both concurred. However, the retention of the cult of the Virgin and the saints with
their relics, and the renewed importance of Eucharistic devotion, as embodied in the true,
absolute and real presence of Christ, were points that were obvious reinforcements of Catholic
medieval traditional positions maintained at Church councils centuries earlier. These notions
were in clear opposition to the novel Protestant theology that argued for abandonment of the cult
of the Virgin and saints and a more symbolic presence in the Eucharist and other sacraments that
remained or were disputed. Though clear ecclesiastical reforms arose—no sale of indulgences,
one bishop per diocese, a better-educated clergy, and so forth—the council failed to produce any
kind of opening for reunifying the Christianity developing to the north. Trent, actually, was a
“reformation” and a Counter-Reformation, one directed to ongoing processes from within the
remaining Roman Catholic Church, the other directed to challenges from without, in the newly
developing Protestant churches.

Though some of the north was lost, Rome and the papacy tried once again to assert their
universality in the world, which included the Americas, parts of India, sections of Africa and
parts of eastern Asia such as the Philippines (named after Phillip II of Spain). It was also at this
time that attempts at luring Orthodox Christians back into a unified church came about by setting
up Orthodox Uniate Rites. At this point, Rome was modestly successful. In all these attempts,
the arts were an effective form of propaganda. They helped to articulate the renewed confidence
of the Roman Church and its claims to dominance over the Christian faith worldwide. Painting,
sculpture, and architecture aggrandized the now unquestioned leader of Catholicism, the pontiff.
The Council of Trent was quite clear about the usefulness of art in instruction, in veneration, in education, and in the search for the ever-elusive trait of “virtue” which validated the church along with the virtuous church leadership.

The holy council commands all bishops and others who hold the office of teaching and have charge of the cura animarum, that in accordance with the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and with the unanimous teaching of the holy Fathers and the decrees of sacred councils, they above all instruct the faithful diligently in matters relating to intercession and invocation of the saints, the veneration of relics, and the legitimate use of images. Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints are to be placed and retained especially in the churches, and that due honor and veneration is to be given them; not, however, that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them by reason of which they are to be venerated, or that something is to be asked of them, or that trust is to be placed in images, as was done of old by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols; but because the honor which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which they represent, so that by means of the images which we kiss and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints whose likeness they bear. That is what was defined by the decrees of the councils, especially of the Second Council of Nicaea, against the opponents of images.10

Most importantly, the council prescribed that images were for public consumption, for teaching, and for use in propagation of the faith. This was an enhancement of the assumed role of art as the “book of the illiterate.” Council fathers and other writers argued that art, because it was visual, was in some ways superior to reading or hearing.

Moreover, let the bishops diligently teach that by means of the stories of the mysteries of our redemption portrayed in paintings and other representations the people are instructed and confirmed in the articles of faith, which ought to be borne in mind and constantly reflected upon; also that great profit is derived from all holy images, not only because the people are thereby reminded of the benefits and gifts bestowed on them by Christ, but also because through the saints the miracles of God and salutary examples are set before the eyes of the faithful, so that they may give God thanks for those things, may fashion their own life and conduct in imitation of the saints and be moved to adore and love God and cultivate piety. But if anyone should teach or maintain anything contrary to these decrees,

let him be anathema. If any abuses shall have found their way into these holy and salutary observances, the holy council desires earnestly that they be completely removed, so that no representation of false doctrines and such as might be the occasion of grave error to the uneducated be exhibited. And if at times it happens, when this is beneficial to the illiterate, that the stories and narratives of the Holy Scriptures are portrayed and exhibited, the people should be instructed that not for that reason is the divinity represented in picture as if it can be seen with bodily eyes or expressed in colors or figures. Furthermore, in the invocation of the saints, the veneration of relics, and the sacred use of images, all superstition shall be removed, all filthy quest for gain eliminated, and all lasciviousness avoided, so that images shall not be painted and adorned with a seductive charm, or the celebration of saints and the visitation of relics be perverted by the people into boisterous festivities and drunkenness, as if the festivals in honor of the saints are to be celebrated with revelry and with no sense of decency. Finally, such zeal and care should be exhibited by the bishops with regard to these things that nothing may appear that is disorderly or unbecoming and confusedly arranged, nothing that is profane, nothing disrespectful, since holiness becometh the house of God. That these things may be the more faithfully observed, the holy council decrees that no one is permitted to erect or cause to be erected in any place or church, howsoever exempt, any unusual image unless it has been approved by the bishop: also that no new miracles be accepted and no relics recognized unless they have been investigated and approved by the same bishop, who, as soon as he has obtained any knowledge of such matters, shall, after consulting theologians and other pious men, act thereon as he shall judge consonant with truth and piety. But if any doubtful or grave abuse is to be eradicated, or if indeed any graver question concerning these matters . . . should arise, the bishop, before he settles the controversy, shall await the decision of the metropolitan and of the bishops of the province in a provincial synod; so, however, that nothing new or anything that has not hitherto been in use in the Church, shall be decided upon without having first consulted the most holy Roman pontiff.11

The significance of the Council of Trent was that the stylistic changes evident in the visual arts at the beginning of the Baroque Period were traced in a great part to the historical developments of the council’s attitude toward proper religious and societal art proclaimed in 1564. The council had heard the criticisms of reformers within and without the church regarding the superstitious nature of veneration of some art in isolated places. It had also heard the criticisms launched about the lascivious nature of some of the stylishly complicated works of Mannerism that were almost unintelligible except by the cognoscenti.

11 H. J. Schroeder, 378.
Two central bishops to influence though on art and its use were Charles Borromeo and Gabrielle Paleotti. They would clarify the focus of art for the Catholic world and the Baroque in their writings and in their programs. Both of these figures were widely influential in establishing guidelines for the creation of Catholic religious art. These bishops vigorously opposed many of the themes and designs favored by the Mannerists of their day. They also called for a return to the High Renaissance ideals of naturalism and clarity for new church commissions. New works of art were to return to the vocabulary of the High Renaissance artists such as Titian, Raphael, Leonardo and Michelangelo before he helped initiate the Mannerist style. The iconography should be a vocabulary understood and developed in previous Christian history. In a way, these bishops also helped to enhance the value of these artists’ works. Charles I collected Titian, Raphael, Leonardo and others for these very same reasons.

Borromeo and Paleotti both argued that the Council of Trent emphasized a Christian art that returned to an emphasis on the Theological Virtues (faith, hope and love/charity) and the Four Cardinal Virtues (temperance, fortitude, prudence and justice). Both authors found these cardinal virtues in the Book of Wisdom. “She [Wisdom] teaches temperance, and prudence, and justice and fortitude, which are such things as men, can have nothing more profitable in life.”12 Here Solomon expressed his view that the greatest gifts that God could give rulers were these cardinal virtues capped by wisdom. Trent then, in its artistic regulations, called the church and society back to the recognition of this virtuous tradition of art and away from the decadence of Mannerist style, which became dominant after the sack of Rome in 1527. It is also important to note that these virtues were central in propaganda works dealing with Absolutism.

12 The New American Bible (Cleveland, Ohio: Collins World, 1976), 782-783.
Borromeo was an enthusiastic promoter of religious images. One of the thirty-three chapters of his treatise, *Instructiones Fabricae Et Supellectilis Ecclesiasticae* / *Instructions for Builders and Decorators of Churches*, published in 1577, was an instruction on how an artist should treat sacred themes. Borromeo taught that religious art should present themes in a clear, intelligible, and instructive way so that the viewer images would be encouraged toward conversion. He wrote, “The bishop [should] be attentive to the decrees of the Council of Trent and the Provincial Constitutions, but also a heavy punishment or fine has to be set for painters and sculptors so that they do not depart from the prescribed realities in their works.”\(^\text{13}\) His emphasis on the church’s control of religious art is also seen in his notion that offending clerics, who sponsored art that was not responsive to the new vision of Trent for an appropriate and dignified art product, should also be penalized by fines and punishments. “Penalties also have been determined in regard to pastors, who, contrary to the prescribed rules of the Tridentine Decree, have permitted an unusual and offensive image to be painted or placed in their churches.”\(^\text{14}\)

Borromeo was clear on what should be avoided or observed in sacred images.

First of all, no sacred image that contains any false teaching should be painted, whether in a church or in any other place; nor any that suggest an occasion of dangerous error to the uneducated; nor, again, any that is contradicted to Sacred Scripture and church tradition. Only such as conform to scriptural truth, traditions, ecclesiastical histories, custom and usage of our mother the Church may be painted.

Likewise, nothing false ought to be introduced in the painting or carving of holy

---

\(^{13}\) Evelyn Carole Voelker, “Charles Borromeo’s *Instructiones Fabricae Et Supellectilis Ecclesiasticae*, 1577. A Translation with Commentary and Analysis” (PhD diss., Syracuse University, 1977), 228. Evelyn Voelker is the first to translate this work from the original 1577 manuscript of Borromeo into English and all references to this document will be from her translation. *Instructiones* was reprinted many times in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century (see Voelker, page 2).

\(^{14}\) E. C. Voelker, 228.
images, neither anything that is uncertain, apocryphal, and superstitious; nothing [of that sort], only that which is in agreement with custom. Similarly whatever is profane, base or obscene, dishonest or provocative, whatever is merely curious and does not incite to piety, or that which can offend the minds and eyes of the faithful should be avoided.  

Borromeo was clear about the propriety of sacred images. “From the bearing, the position, the adornment of the person, the whole expression of sacred images should fittingly and decorously correspond to the dignity and sanctity of their prototype.” Religious subjects in agreement with historical truth, church practice, and the rules decreed by the bishops of Trent were essential for the revitalized use of the arts in Catholic Europe.  

The importance of this chapter in Borromeo’s text (and indeed the entire work) should not be underestimated. Art historian Anthony Blunt notes that Borromeo is “the only author to apply the Tridentine decree to the problem of architecture.” Wittkower and Jaffe note that Borromeo’s Instructiones “have long been identified as a major stimulus to the creation of a Counter-Reformation ecclesiastical style.” This may be true, but it is also true that he was also the spokesman and codifier of a style coming into existence during the last third of the sixteenth century because of Trent’s influence.

---

15 E. C. Voelker, 228-229.

16 E. C. Voelker, 229. I will argue that this quasi-religious and “divine prototype” concept translated to the depiction of royalty during the Baroque Period, especially in the depictions of Charles I.

17 E. C. Voelker, 230.


20 Rudolf Wittkower and I. Jaffe, eds., 20.
With Borromeo’s *Instructiones Fabricae Et Supellectilis Ecclesiasticae* in hand, the Roman Church, through one of its most important and influential bishops, argued that the church keep a firm hand on the helm of art and that the art should be clear, concise, appropriate to its task, and on message.

The Borromean reform emphasized thematic material that was either hagiographic or scriptural. The themes were to be designed to confirm and to encourage faith. Artists working under the direct rule of Cardinals Charles and Federico Borromeo from 1563 to 1630 set the foundation for a distinctive Lombard style and aesthetic, simply because the ‘atmosphere’ required them to do so.21

The artists who were directly affected by guidance of the Cardinals Borromeo are among the greatest of the late sixteenth-century and early seventeenth-century, and include Giovanni Crespi, Domenico Pellegrini, Nebbia, and Caravaggio.22 Caravaggio’s style would become synonymous with the birth of Baroque painting for its reality, its emotion, and its drama and achieved pan-European status.

The second important example of artistic treatises produced by Catholic churchmen is Gabriele Paleotti’s *Discorso intorno alle imagini sacre e profane* / *Discourse on Sacred and Profane Images* written in 1582. Like Borromeo, Paleotti was a bishop who oversaw the production of Christian art in his diocese. Paleotti’s instructional guide was an attempt to attract a pan-European readership.23 He directly influenced style along with the notion that visual art

---

21 E. C. Voelker, 235.

22 E. C. Voelker, 235.

was as important as or even superior to aural artistic forms, such as preaching or literature.

*Discorso intorno alle imagini sacre e profane* was translated into English.

Paleotti was one of the most vital influences in directing art from its Mannerist tendencies toward Baroque clarity. At the end of the 1570s, he dedicated himself to writing a large theological treatise about the correct uses of sculpture and painting within the church. His work *De sacris et profanis imaginibus libri V*, published in Bologna in 1582, was as insistent as Borromeo’s treatise that religious art’s primary message must be clear and forcefully convey Catholic ideology. He recommended that art should return to the naturalism of the Renaissance and that historical realism must return to painting. Several prominent artists studied Paleotti’s recommendations and adopted his viewpoint, including Annibale, Lodovico, and Agostino Carracci, all key figures in the early Baroque. Paleotti went so far as to suggest that artists and art should be regulated similarly to the way books were regulated, calling for an institution of the church to supervise and censor art. Paleotti conceived the following theory in *Discorso*:

> Heretics have denied the efficacy of images. To prohibit their use would be to commit a serious injustice against infinite numbers of people, and perhaps against the majority of the Christian populace, not only because it would constitute depriving them of their sensual ability to gain knowledge of necessary things, but also because knowledge necessary for the health of the soul would be inaccessible to countless unfortunate illiterates.24

Paleotti’s quest for the “health of the soul” through “their sensual ability to gain knowledge” shows his adroit understanding of and attention to the importance of a theory of Image. His conception of the “reception of art” was formulated in using painting as a universal language, as argued from the earliest times of the Christian experience. As one of the leading Roman Catholic apologists of the sixteenth-century, Paleotti, as with earlier Christian apologists,  

---

drew on the tradition established in the early church of the universality of art. This tradition was embedded in the theology of Christ as the “New Adam,” the “Image” of God. To Paleotti, the universality of man-made images was tied to the way in which humanity perceived painting, sculpture, and indeed knowledge. Vision helped to connect man with expressed human longings for contact with the divine through sight. For Paleotti, God gave man the ability to create images, which aided his natural desire to know and represent both the material and the spiritual realms. Paleotti remarked that the imitation of the creator, in man’s ability to create, was what made humanity unique among God’s creatures. In his work, one sees the echoing of Pico Della Mirandola’s positive view of human potential celebrated in the *Oration on the Dignity of Man*.

Paleotti’s sources were the Aristotelian and Thomistic views the Catholic Church had embraced since the high Middle Ages. “Discussions of Man’s cognitive abilities found in Aristotle’s *De Anima* and *Poetics* and Thomas Aquinas’s *Suma Theologica* were the general basis for Paleotti’s understanding of human knowledge, including his remark that knowledge begins with the senses.” Paleotti argued that the sense of vision was superior to hearing. He argued, “the ear was an inferior cognitive organ because the voice was personal, serving merely in a few places at a few times. It was not always possible to obtain words of explanation, and

---


26 Gabriele Paleotti, Book I, Chapter 4, 139-141.

even when it was, auditory sensation had less longevity than visual; images, rather than words, imprinted information on one’s memory for a longer time.”28 Image was superior.

Following the iconophiles before him, Paleotti believed that painting was the universal language. He argued that for aural arts to succeed, one must understand the language and the author and have not only an opportunity for learning but also the ability to comprehend and to find real value or truth in literature, even sacred scripture.29 For Paleotti, painting was more egalitarian, more democratic. This Roman Catholic position confirmed the power of art. For Paleotti and many other Counter-Reformation Catholics, art was for the advancement of what was good, true and eternal and was a superior “language” of God in many ways. It was an extremely powerful tool of propaganda. This “truth” was not lost on the rulers of this period.

Paleotti maintained that the visual process had a direct bearing on the reception of concepts. Art had a capacity to explaining central ideas by its very nature because it promoted reflection on God’s creation and used the senses to internalize through artistic re-creation.

Mankind’s knowledge is of three sorts: the first is sensual, which is had by means of senses; tasting, smelling, touching, etc.; the other is rational, which, if it also originates in the senses, passes by means of reason and material thing; the third is supernatural, being born from a divine light infused in us by means of faith, through which we believe and know things that exceed not only the capacity of the senses, but also every human discourse and rational intelligence. We call this spiritual cognition, which was given to earthly and innocent souls by the singular grace of God.30

Spiritual cognition was useful in persuading the viewer in the practice piety, thus directing the viewer to God. “Like sacred oratory, sacred painting also had more specific ends, such as

28 Pamela M. Jones, 125. For Paleotti’s arguments about the eye over the ear, see Discorso, Book I, Chapter 4, 139-140 and Book I, Chapter 18, 207-208.
29 Gabriele Paleotti, Book I, Chapter 23, 221.
30 Gabriele Paleotti, Book I, Chapter 22, 216-217.
moving Christians to penitence, voluntary suffering, charity, disdain for the world, and the
obedience and awe they owe God.” It seems clear that this line of reasoning, this
understanding of the importance of art translated to propaganda works for the state as well as for
the Christian God. Papal works of the late Mannerism and the Baroque combined both purposes:
church and state. Rome produced many multi-purpose works combining religious awe with
papal political power.

One of the arguments Paleotti used for his understanding of art was Aristotle’s notion of
delight. He noted that a

higher level of rational knowledge with its accompanying delight . . . [one could] reach the
highest level, that of supernatural knowledge with its corresponding spiritual delight only
if—under divine inspiration—he considered how God, in his great providence and
wisdom, wanted by means of created things to provide human beings with a staircase by
which to ascend to the celestial realm of eternal bliss.  

Paleotti applied this cognitive process to the act of seeing art in the “marvelous pleasure and
recreation [through] the variety of colors, shadows, figures, and ornaments, and the diverse
things represented in them [artworks]—such as mountains, rivers, gardens, cities, landscapes,
and other things.”

Through the viewer’s imagination the artwork—in Paleotti’s case, painting—caused
delight that would lead to something more than simple pleasure or connoisseurship. Here
Paleotti again aligned himself with Aristotelian thought.

Aristotle wrote in the Poetics that since man alone among all the other animals was born to
imitate, by instinct he derives very great delight and pleasure from imitation. Imitation

31 Pamela M. Jones, “Art Theory as Ideology: Gabriele Paleotti’s Hierarchical Notion of
Painting’s Universality and Reception,” 128-129.

32 Pamela M. Jones, 128-129.

33 Gabriele Paleotti, Book I, Chapter 22, 218.
seems to have been born of the virtue of reason, which is peculiar to man. . . . And this imitation, which is so obvious in painting, causes delight. It immediately renders present to man things that are far away. And in the manner of the omnipotent hand of God and of nature, his minister, painting brings to life in a moment men, animals, plants, rivers, palaces, churches, and all the same works are seen in this great machine of the world. . . . Thus, the more closely painting imitates life and truth, the more rational delight they carry.  

Paleotti was somewhat of a “mystic” on how this was to take place within one who viewed sacred art. He was not particularly specific about how to achieve this level of cognition. However, Paleotti believed that the pious were able to achieve this level of mystical thought as with understanding of sacred scripture. “We do not doubt that a person who will look at Christian paintings with purged eyes will be able to participate in all of these delights.” For Paleotti the “pure of heart” would simply see the truth in these religious works.

Paleotti, as with the Council of Trent and Borromeo before him, did not think Mannerism could fulfill the necessary requirements for sacred art. There is a clear “reaction against this style [Mannerism, which] no doubt prompted the objections found in both Paleotti’s Discorso and the Council of Trent’s decree on images [that were] confusing, indecorous art.” Art needed to be more precise and clear to be useful for universal understanding.

Paleotti’s Discorso promoted the church’s position that art had a uniquely powerful universal language. According to Jones, Paleotti emphasized that proper sacred art should have design, in the sense of both intellectual and manual creation, to produce acceptable ecclesial works. For Paleotti, artworks should be clearly composed and highly finished based on their

---

34 Gabriele Paleotti, Book I, Chapter 22, 218-219.

35 Gabriele Paleotti, Book I, Chapter 22, 220.

36 Pamela M. Jones, 131.

37 Pamela M. Jones, 143.
reception for mixed audiences; this included the cognoscenti, the intellectually trained and the vast majority of Christians: common illiterate folk. Clear presentation was necessary because the vast majority of viewers were “uneducated, sensually inclined, and less intelligent than the educated few. This notion, which runs like a leitmotif throughout the Discorso, cannot be over-emphasized.”

However, he did not believe that art should be “watered down.” Paleotti referred to Psalm 96 vs. 6, and explained that magnificence appeals to the high intellect, as well as the uneducated. In the final chapter of Book 2 of Discorso, he argued that the way David taught the people of the Old Testament should be an example and that the same magnificence of universally good painting should be used. “Confession,” “beauty,” “holiness,” and “magnificence” were the words David used in Psalm 96 vs. 6 in the translation of the Vulgate. This psalm centered on the glories of the Lord as the king of the universe. It emphasized his power and majesty as inventor of a beautiful and good creation. According to Paleotti, confession, beauty, holiness and magnificence were regarded as the four “principal characteristics of sacred painting.”

Paleotti also believed that paintings of ordinary landscapes and such “profane” works could lead the viewer to spiritual cognition and teach about the universal truths and the natural order of the universe. As with most others of his age, his notion of the ordinary, which occupied a low place in God’s hierarchical universe, could lead one up the steps to celestial things and to the knowledge of celestial matters. This, of course, was a positive view of the universe and creation. Younger ecclesiastical colleagues, such as Robert Bellarmine and Federico Borromeo, also had views of the universe and humanity that were more positive than some of their own.

---

38 Pamela M. Jones, 134.

39 Pamela M. Jones, 134.
Catholic contemporaries, and certainly more positive and optimistic than those who had accepted St. Augustine’s view of man living in a completely fallen state.\textsuperscript{40} The study of the universe could reveal as much about God, his plan, and natural order and law, as could the holy.

Though Paleotti was a man of his time who believed in hierarchy, rank, order and a natural law of the superior versus inferior in society (a view reprehensible to twentieth-century readers), he was typical of any man of his elite status of his day. However, a glimmer of Christian optimism appears for the ordinary person. Even though the “ordinary” majority could not rise to the greatest heights of metaphysical speculation when viewing paintings of nature or of sacred history, they could nonetheless ascend to the highest spiritual cognition. Though Paleotti did not explain in \textit{Discorso} how a person became one of the “purged eyed” who ascended into the spiritual realm, he did reveal how he brought himself to that level. He used spiritual exercises on a uniform and regular basis, and these raised his spiritual state. He certainly believed others could do likewise. In his view and in that of other Catholic reformers mentioned so far in this study, a lack of education was not an obstacle to movement up the spiritual ladder.\textsuperscript{41} Combined

\textsuperscript{40} Pamela M. Jones. \textit{Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana: Art Patronage and Reform in Seventeenth-century Milan} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). For a thorough discussion of the optimism of Bellarmine and Borromeo as well as Augustine’s point of view, see in particular pages 33-36 and 76-89. The importance of the goodness of creation and the ability of man to achieve knowledge and grace through active engagement in the created world was something that was in direct opposition to many of the reformers’ ideology.

\textsuperscript{41} One of the great Counter-Reformation spiritual exercises was the retreat offered by St. Ignatius in his \textit{Spiritual Exercises}. Paleotti devoted ten days per year to performing the \textit{Spiritual Exercises}. Paolo Prodi, \textit{Il Cardinale Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1596)}. 2 vols. (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e letteratura, 1959-1967), 36. All of three Counter-Reformation thinkers, Borromini, Paleotti, and Borromeo thought meditation on sacred history and the divine mysteries could move one up the spiritual ladder. None of these presupposed that one had to be literate. Protestant theology emphasized the more elitist notion that it was primarily through literacy that one could achieve spiritual knowledge, not through visual or emotional means. This was one of the major differences, which separated Christianity during the Reformation. Counter-
with spiritual exercises, the visual “road” would be the most effective way to the celestial for the masses.

Paleotti’s notion of the viewer’s response to art in the Discorso itself and his thoughts in general lead us to the notion that art, and in particular painting, was one of the most important ways to express ideas. The post-Tridentine worldview that prevailed throughout the Catholic ecclesiastical hierarchies was a continuation of the microcosmic experience to understand God’s macrocosm. Art was used to inform one’s notion of the universe, which was hierarchical, positive, and decreed by the Creator as useful for man’s spiritual endeavors. Paleotti’s theory, well known throughout Europe, informed many of the artists of his day in Italy and eventually throughout most of Catholic Europe and possibly the New World. Because of the Council of Trent, Borromeo and other like-minded thinkers, Baroque art developed and superseded the more ambiguous and less useful Mannerist style. It was the first pan-European style since the International Style three centuries earlier to inform the beliefs of a majority of European culture in religion, politics and hierarchy.

**Change of Style: The Importance of Catholicism’s Influence**

It is clear with Trent and the multiple treatises written by Catholic ecclesiastics that the Roman Church by the 1580s had a template for the use of art for political as well as religious purposes. The treatises, such as Charles Borromeo’s *Instructiones Fabricae et Supellectilis Ecclesiasticae* of 1577, and Robert Bellarmine’s *Disputationes*, with its 1586 dedication to Pope Sixtus V, and Gabriele Paleotti’s *Discorso*, were published in Germany, Italy and Spain.42

---

Reformation saints included men, such as the illiterate St. Isidore the Farmer, who was known for his spiritual power and example.

In contrast to Baroque, Mannerism was a style of complicated innuendo, subterfuge, and “odd” non-classical beauty, luxuriant and complex. An iconic example of this style is Parmigianino’s *Madonna with the Long Neck* (A-2). In this work, we see all the ambiguity, deception, lack of clarity, and luxuriant use of color this style could express. Though this work is indeed “beautiful,” it is unsuccessful in its ability to produce piety and fails to communicate devotion to the viewer.

Art regained its original purpose: communication of ideas, instruction, and propaganda by use of the ideal, the classical and naturalistic beauty that was true to subject, patron, and ideology. It was also to be an art of “virtue” that primarily expressed cultural values or the absence of these values if this was part of the intention of the scriptural, religious, political, or ideological story imparted to the viewer. One prime example of this type of art would be Bernini’s *David* (A-3), completed around 1623.

The Council of Trent maintained the efficacy of images to convey the messages of belief not as simply recommended but as imperative. This was contrary to the belief of some—though not all—of the newly established churches. Lutheranism was in agreement with the use of art for communication and propaganda, as well as for a devotional aid to the faithful. However, many of the fledgling Calvinistic churches were directly opposed to the use of religious images as sacrilegious, nothing but idolatry. Art could be in the home, of course, and possibly even religious art could be displayed there, but not in the church. Even a few Calvinists were against the portrait as prideful, self-aggrandizement. Overall, among Calvinists, no clear agreement on

---

43 When one refers to Calvinism, one must admit that from the beginning there was no pan-Calvinist communion that allowed this group of churches any kind of real unitary bond or doctrine.
art existed except for the strong distrust of religiously themed art in general. England’s hybrid church did not have a cohesive policy for or against images. Confusion seems to have been the official policy when it came time for implementation of Parliamentary, Crown, or church directives, especially during the reign of Elizabeth I. Iconoclastic periods in England hampered the use of religious art and would have questioned the use of absolutist art with any religious connotations.

However, for Catholicism, the reach of the Decrees of the Council of Trent were far-flung and retroactive. The Roman Church attempted to “censure” even previous masterworks that were deemed inappropriate for religious consumption. Works such as Michelangelo’s _The Last Judgment_ (A-1) were attacked for their lack of modesty. One response to the offensiveness of its nudity led to Daniele da Volterra--immediately after Michelangelo’s death--covering the genital areas of many of the nude figures in the fresco. This earned him the nickname of the “Braghettoni,” or “breeches-painter.” Even the greatest artist of the Renaissance was not immune to the new movement toward virtue and propriety.

Other important artists who worked in the last third of the sixteenth-century were brought before the Office of the Inquisition because they did not follow the directives of Trent. For
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44. This will be one of the central topics discussed in chapter 3. Ambiguity, plain style, or even the destruction of art was the rule in many Calvinist areas of Europe. This ambiguity was true in England concerning art, religion, and monarchy, and any monumental use of image during the Tudor period after the reform.

45. Many of the tried and true religious images loved and venerated in the English Church of the Middle Ages were more or less abandoned. The Crucifix and the Madonna were often ridiculed as signs of popery and were replaced by the coat of arms of the monarch at the front of the church. These uncertain, eclectic, and at times iconoclastic views toward art are discussed in the chapter 3.

example, Veronese’s grand painting with over life-sized figures, the House of Levi (A-4) was originally conceived as a Last Supper. When questioned by the Inquisition for not following the narrative of sacred scripture, and for the painting’s ambiguity and its overly sumptuous expression, Veronese’s response was not to substantially alter the painting but to simply do minor adjustments and rename the work. This allowed him to show the festive atmosphere in the painting by “changing” the subject. It would not pass the specifications of a clear, virtuous re-enactment of the Lord’s Supper and institution of the Mass, but it did present a feast described in the scripture at the House of Levi. Catholic standards about religious painting had changed dramatically, and this also had effect on political art. The Council of Trent, and bishops like Bellarmine, Paleotti, and Borromeo were central to this change in art. The Roman pontiffs, however, were major innovators who implemented these ideas in vast new building and artistic projects at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth-century.

**Italy the Leader**

The art of the mid-sixteenth-century had fallen into mere pale imitation of the works of Michelangelo, Raphael, and Leonardo. Mannerism was a style that offered imitation of art in which form dominated yet conviction was lacking. By 1580, new artists of conviction appeared in northern Italy. Their works were characterized by a renewed adherence to naturalism, which breathed new life into the depleted artistic world of Italy and Europe. Caravaggio, Annibale Carracci, and Federico Barocchi created works that were novel in their close observation of the natural world and in the freshness of their artistic insight. Their art once again spoke clearly, reflecting the notion of Paleotti, who taught in his *Discorso* that the

---

rendering of the microcosm could connect one to the macrocosm of the universe through the clarity of presentation and the study of beauty. Also influenced by the wide-reaching thoughts of Trent and the artistic theologians, new “stars,” such as Borromini and Bernini, would transform the outward appearance of Rome in a celebration of the “Church Triumphant,” real or not.

Milan initially guided Italy after the council. Charles Borromeo, as Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, was instrumental in leading reforms. Religious leaders were the quickest to counter Protestant challenges to the Roman Church because of their proximity to Germany and because of constant threats of political domination from the north. Encouraging art that was simpler, more powerful, direct, and free of preciosity and artificiality, Lombardy laid the groundwork for the prescriptions of the Council of Trent.48 However, it did not take long for other prelates and rulers to take advantage of art that showed clarity of style and the return to classical ideals of virtuous ideology and leadership. Though the northern of Italy was the leader for the initial years from Borromeo and families such as the D’Este, because of the usefulness of this style, the pope embraced it for his own propaganda.

One of the major artistic themes that re-emerged in this period was a view that the bishop of Rome had the right to be “senior” emperor, as was argued in the Middle Ages. These “legendary” stories, whether steeped in fact or fiction, were widely believed and huge artistic cycles during the pontificates at the turn of and during the seventeenth-century were created as they had been in the early Renaissance and medieval times. The right of the pope to this exalted position was reflected in the fanatical devotion of the Jesuits and in the art produced for papal propaganda, as well as in the print of the day that supported the religious and political dominance

48 John T. Paleotti and Gary M. Radke, 417.
of Rome. At the end of the sixteenth-century the legends of antiquity were put into stone and paint by Pope Sixtus V in San Giovanni in Laterano, the Cathedral of Rome.

The Roman pontiff’s claim was not only to superiority in the spiritual realm. Popes made vast political claims that they saw as substantiated by precedent and by church councils along with medieval texts, such as the *Donation of Constantine*. Even though it was known to be apocryphal and a forgery, it was still politically expedient for the “spin” of the day. There was historically a “ring of truth” in that the papacy was the most important institution to survive the fall of the Western Roman Empire and fill a vast political and spiritual gap left by the empire’s demise for close to 800 years. Yes, there was an empire, but who crowned the emperor? After all, the papacy had made an emperor wait in the snow in the Middle Ages to do penance. Therefore, the popes of a renewed and reinvigorated Catholic Church hoped to wield the same kind of political jurisdiction and prestige in their age as they “believed” popes had wielded (real or not) in previous ages.

The papacy’s vocabulary in art was drawn from sacred scripture, from the glorious past of the Roman Empire, from the philosophical worlds of Plato, Aristotle, and medieval saints. These popes used ideas from the virtuous writings of pagan Rome and Greece to extend and justify their use of personal power and the power of the church, proclaiming their absolute rights through art and building. Of course, the learned of the time would recognize this vocabulary immediately, whether or not they agreed with the themes and teleological views expressed by the papacy. Much of it was so clear that even the unlearned could appreciate the legendary stories and Biblical justifications for papal power that was like “background noise” for their culture.

Popes such as Sixtus V, Clement VIII, Paul V, Gregory XV, and finally the most important pope for this study, Urban VIII, all rallied to the notion of the magnificence of the Papal States.
They regenerated and made splendid its capital, Rome, the true Christian heir of the ancient world and biblical heritage, in their minds at least. All these pontiffs were important in their connection with England and the monarchy in either a positive or a negative connotation. Some had relatively sour relations with London; others had relatively cordial relationships, an oddity when considering the “venom” often spewed by bigots on both sides of the religious divide. These relationships are important to this study for numerous reasons and they will be integrated throughout the remainder of this paper.

The Rome that was famous then and indeed famous today and has been seen by untold millions of tourists is not primarily the Rome of the early or high Renaissance but of the late Mannerist and Baroque artistic periods. These pontiffs transformed late Mannerism into the Baroque style by their use of art and their patronage of the most important artists of the day. They also directly affected artistic cycles and plans for the works constructed. It was a city and a style that was eventually emulated as far north as Sweden.

Along with the popes, their nephews, and sometimes their children, and the cardinal princes, and other dignitaries attached to the papal court, popes provided commissions on an unprecedented scale. “Painters, sculptors, architects and artisans of all kinds had always been drawn to Rome, but now in response to the recommendations of the Council of Trent to reform and reinvigorate the Catholic Church using art as a vehicle, a whole new range of possibilities open[ed] up.”49 The first pope who truly anticipated the Baroque style was Pope Sixtus V (April 24, 1585-August 27, 1590). Sixtus was one of the greatest reformers and implementers of the council. He shared the council fathers’ vision of the use of art as a “virtuous” tool to teach, proclaim, and explain the political as well as religious attitudes of resurgent Catholicism.

49 Catherine Jonston, 15.
From the beginning of the pontificate of Sixtus V, a true believer in the papal legacy, the reassertion arose of the importance of papal credibility expressed in art and public works, as well as a less corrupt government in the Papal States. Sixtus modernized Rome by bringing water with the Aqua Vergine, straightened the streets, finished the dome of St. Peter’s, and declared war on crime. Rome was to be a city of almost “puritan” morals in its disregard for decadence or graft, but he was certainly not Puritan when it came to art. Within a short time, the Papal States were quiet and safe and on excellent financial footing; therefore, Sixtus began using the vast surplus of wealth generated by new taxes on public works and art commissions. What the pope achieved in a relatively short time was nothing short of miraculous.

Towards the end of the century under Pope Sixtus V, the city itself was re-planned as we see it today—with long straight streets connecting oval points adjacent to important churches. Each focal point was marked by a fountain or an antique obelisk. It was the declared aim of Sixtus V to make the city once more a worthy capital, a worthy Christianized successor to pagan Imperial Rome.50

Sixtus added the Loggia of Sixtus to the Basilica di San Giovanni in Laterano, the Chapel of the Preaepe in Santa Maria Maggiore, and as well an addition and repairs to the Lateran Palace (A-5) and the Quirinal and Vatican palaces. Most impressive of the political works in Rome was the setting up of four obelisks, including one in St. Peter’s Square. These became symbols of the church triumphant. All were crowned with religious symbols of Catholic Christianity, the cross, saints Peter and Paul, or the Virgin Mary. All were also marked with the pope’s family crest as a glorification of his personal “good rule” and as a member of the “papal dynasty” inherited upon becoming successor of the prince of the apostles.

In a not-so-subtle statement, Sixtus communicated his hegemony as Vicar of Christ of the Roman Church over the empires of the world, both past and present. To emphasize further that

50Madeleine Mainstone and Rowland Mainstone, 2.
he and the church were the inheritors of the classical world, he placed bronze Christian statues of
St. Peter and St. Paul on top of the columns of Trajan and Antoninus, showing the domination of
the city’s saints over its pagan past. Even the Minerva of the Capitol was not safe; it was
converted into an allegory of Christian Rome. For Sixtus, art was a way of validating his rule and
the absolute rule of the Roman Church, not only over the religious world but over the political
world as well. In his view, he was “senior” monarch.

Sixtus V’s political involvement was extremely important in defining the relationship that
Catholicism was to have with England. He agreed to renew the excommunication of Queen
Elizabeth I of England and granted a large subsidy to the Spanish Armada of King Philip II
(former King Philip I of England) when he heard of the execution of Mary Queen of Scots. The
Spanish and the papacy throughout Elizabeth’s reign were the foils and the excuse for her firm
control of government. Because of Philip and Sixtus’s opposition, Spanish and Catholic baiting
became the favorite sport of the day. With the negative heritage of her sister Queen Mary I as a
foundation for anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic attitudes, Elizabeth’s policies became enshrined
not only in government but in the mindset of the English. This remains to the present age.51

Sixtus was more successful in his dealings with France. Sixtus excommunicated Henry of
Navarre. However, the slim prospect of the conversion of Henry to Catholicism did not stop
Sixtus from negotiating with Henry’s representative. Eventually Henry converted and France

---

51 Catholic conspiracies against the crown such as Guy Fawkes Day, November 5, are
still celebrated in England with fireworks and bonfires, on which effigies of the conspirator are
burned, though it was Protestant Puritans who executed a king and briefly disbanded the British
Empire formed by James I. The immense strain over religion between England and Spain along
with Sixtus and the succeeding popes complicated any attempts at reconciliation and gave ample
fodder to those who continued to demonize Catholics as tools of the papacy in England whether
they were like Fawkes or not. Recently, Prime Minister Tony Blair waited to “officially convert”
to Catholicism until he was out of office even though he had attended the Roman Church for
years to avoid political scandal.
was brought finally into the Catholic fold. France became the great Catholic rival of the
Hapsburgs once again. Henry’s marriage to Catharine d’ Medici also helped to move Italianate
ideas north into France. Their daughter, Henrietta Maria, would become the Queen of England
and Charles would stop in Paris on his way to Spain. Henrietta Maria was a founder of the arts in
England, involved in the masques, art collection, and construction in the Stuart court.\[^{52}\] The
renewed use of art during the long pontificate of Sixtus influenced the habits and political
fortunes of his successors and princes in the Catholic world, and the Protestant sphere as well.
John Peacock notes that the artistic influence of Sixtus V reached England in that the Catafalque
for James I (A-7) is modeled after the Tempietto-like catafalque for Sixtus V (A-7 C).\[^{53}\] Inigo
Jones mirrored the most solemn funeral rights of the papacy for a Protestant king.

The next papal innovator in the Baroque Period was Clement VIII (January 30, 1592-
March 3, 1605).

Pope Clement VIII is perhaps better remembered for his temporal achievements: his efforts
to bring back France and Poland into the bosom of the Church, his espousal of the
Congregation of Missions in the Orient, Africa, and the New World, and for the annexation
of Ferrara to the Papal States. Yet he was a devout and humble man, not averse to walking
barefoot in processions and pilgrimages.\[^{54}\]

Clement also had a relatively long pontificate. He was responsible for the Synod of Brest held in
1595 in Lithuania, where a great part of the Ruthenian clergy and people were reunited with the
Roman Church. The most important aspect of his papacy was the reconciliation to the Church of
Henry IV of France (1589-1610). Henry “embraced” Catholicism (if not personally, at least

\[^{52}\] This will be a major discussion in Chapter 5.
\[^{53}\] John Peacock, “Inigo Jones’s Catafalque for James I,” *Architectural History* 25,

\[^{54}\] Catherine Jonston, 15.
publicly) on July 25, 1593. After taking a short time to assess Henry’s sincerity, Clement VIII solemnly absolved him, thus putting an end to the thirty years of religious war in France and winning a powerful ally in a reinvigorated and united France.

“Artistically, Clement VIII’s reign was a period of transition. To St. Peter’s he added the bronze orb and cross that crown the lantern above Michelangelo’s cupola, and he commissioned the Cavalier d’Arpino to design the mosaics on its interior surface.”55 Though much of the work done for Clement was somewhat mannered, the style of the works drifted toward a more cohesive and structured composition and understanding. This also was the time that Caravaggio revolutionized painting with his realistic scenes, such as the Calling and Martyrdom of St. Matthew in S. Luigi de Francesi and the Conversion of St. Paul and Crucifixion of St. Peter in the Tiberio Cerasi chapel in Sta. Maria del Popolo.56

Clement VIII was one of the most significant renovators of Baroque Rome. An enormous cycle completed during his pontificate was a religious-political themed decoration of the pope’s Cathedral. Here the legendary relationship of Constantine and Pope Sylvester was put into paint to cement the special political nature of the papacy in the Christian empire. Continuing the policies of his predecessors, Clement used art as a way to connect the church to its past glories in hope of regaining some of that glorious past. These themes of the pristine and celebrated times of the early church were executed at San Giovanni to help celebrate the Holy Year of 1600.57

55 Catherine Jonston, 16.
56 Catherine Jonston, 16-17.
57 The themes of renewing the “pristine early church,” its liturgy and beliefs was also central to “Anglican” thought in the early seventeenth-century.
The first phase of renovations began in the summer of 1596 when he restructured San Giovanni. Clement VIII replaced existing columns with antique columns from the Roman imperial port of Nettuno and with others from the Roman Forum. In a renewed connecting of the basilica to the Roman imperial past, the decoration was to center on Constantine the Great and his political and religious largess to the Roman Church and the papacy. The decoration of San Giovanni involved commemorating the basilica’s importance through an evocation of its special history and precious relics, pursued in the decoration that centered on the high altar, on the one hand, and the appropriate display of the sacrament in the transept, on the other; in the end these separate aims were combined so the Lateran’s glorious past and the ineffable mystery of the Eucharist were fused.

Much of the cycle is a glorification of the loyalty of Constantine to the church and the church’s visible head, the papacy. This was perfectly exemplified by paintings in the cycle, such as Pope Sylvester Baptizes Constantine by Cristoforo Roncalli (Figure 2-1), Giovanni Baglione’s Constantine’s Donation to the Lateran (Figure 2-2), and finally Pope Sylvester Consecrates the High Altar of the Lateran by Giovanni Battista Ricci (A-10).

As a “proto-Baroque” forerunner, the Constantinian cycle at San Giovanni included and expressed a vocabulary of material opulence and activation that extended through the entire wall cycles of the transept. This cycle of frescoes, celebrating the intertwined histories of the Lateran and Constantine, was presented as a series of feigned tapestries attached to the wall of the basilica. The Lateran program of decoration also addressed the hierarchical dignity of the

---


59 Jack Freiberg, 50.

60 Jack Freiberg, 50.
Church of Rome in its primal seat, San Giovanni, the first legal Christian church, indeed the mother of all churches. The Old Testament figures of the priest-kings David and Solomon are located at the entrance of the transept. These figures provide the pre-Christian history of redemption traced from the Old Testament through the incarnation of Christ at the annunciation to the final triumph at the altar when the Lord enters heaven at the ascension. The fresco cycle of Constantine is “sandwiched” between the entrance and the Eucharistic chapel of the church. It is a statement of how the agency of God’s will through the first Christian king, Constantine, established the first permanent and legal church at the Lateran. This cycle ties Christian kingship into the mystery of the Eucharist, which is the central Catholic Christian mystery, by its joining of humanity to the divine purpose and linking all in a common faith.

This Constantinian cycle, a “fusion of three-dimensional forms with illusionistic elements was an ingenious solution to a particularly difficult problem.” Clement VIII wanted to unite the political, spiritual, and physical worlds in a unified statement of Catholic faith. In doing so, Clement also made a statement about the central role of the papacy in Christian political history and about himself as inheritor of that tradition. At the turn of the sixteenth-century, Clement VIII had shown the way through clear, decorative unity for the expression of an art that would communicate story in majesty and naturalism. He made the first Church of Christendom into a template for Baroque propaganda, not only for the use of the church but also indeed for the use of rulers. Though not intentionally, Clement also unwittingly emphasized the role of the Christian king as an important agent of the divine. Monarchs had in the past and would continue
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61 Jack Freiberg, 50.

62 Jack Freiberg, 50.

63 Jack Freiberg, 50.
to use the same political heroes enshrined in the Lateran: Constantine, David, and Solomon. Indeed, this would also reinforce what the Hapsburgs had introduced in their great cycles and building complexes in the second half of the sixteenth-century. These also emphasized the importance of the monarchy in God’s plans, and from a Roman Catholic point of view the salvific, saintly purpose and quality of the monarchy. After all, one of the most important titles expressed at the crucifixion in Latin, Greek, and Aramaic was that Christ was King.

The audience for this renewed artistic vigor was one of the largest in history. According to recent scholarship, the Holy Year of 1600 was a phenomenal success. This was because Clement’s political achievement of securing peace throughout most of Europe enabled more people to make the journey to Rome than ever before possible. Only England and Spain remained major states at war at the time of the Holy Year. It is estimated that as many as three million came for the celebrations. Many, if not most, were from outside of Italy; France and German principalities were well represented.64 English artist, architect and designer Inigo Jones was in Italy during this time. Though his longest and most extensive trip to Italy is the least documented, it seems certain that he would have gone to Rome to study the newly finished works at the Lateran, which received universal acclaim at their completion. Scholars agree he had lived and studied in Italy for several years before the turn of the century and returned to England some time in 1601.65 Though Jones was careful to keep his religious leanings to himself, it is not a stretch of the imagination that he studied the pomp and circumstance of the Holy Year because most biographers agree he was Catholic. As a young artist, architect, and


designer, it is inconceivable that he would pass up a momentous opportunity to study the regenerated churches and monuments of the Eternal City. As a Catholic, he may have even studied them with some spiritual motivation.

His most important early biographers, including J. Alfred Gotch, maintained that both Inigo and his father were Roman Catholics. The Dictionary of National Biography affirms this with confidence. There is no doubt that he was friendly with many Catholics in his early years: Edmund Bolton and Tobie Matthew were two, both converts to the faith as young men and both stubborn in the refusal to abandon it. He also had a long friendship with the Earl of Arundel, Thomas Howard, a member of one of the country’s leading Catholic families though he [Arundel] eventually became a Protestant for political convenience.

It is also vital to note that Jones was particularly close to Queen Anne of Denmark and Queen Henrietta Maria, both Catholics. Clearly, this was in part because of their love of the arts, but another explanation for their close affinity might have been as co-religionists. All three then would have been Catholics in a “sea” of Protestants.

Jones would have certainly noted that Clement’s chosen central theme for the Holy Year of 1600 was political unity and spiritual reconciliation in the Lateran decorations. It intentionally drew parallels to the Golden Age of the Catholic Church, which existed during the reigns of Constantine and Sylvester. In the Clementine transept, the paradisiacal, Constantinian, and Eucharistic resonances coalesced into a momentous statement about the political and spiritual achievements of Clement VIII. The decision to give these themes tangible form at San Giovanni

67 Michael Leapman, 18.
was a precise correspondence between visual and conceptual expression with its associations with the Universal Church and the historical and eschatological future that longed for concord and unity as their fundamental reference points. The Lateran was the beginning of the great flowering of ecclesiastical and papal art during the seventeenth-century.

Another of Clement’s key contributions to artistic development in Rome was his annexation of the territory of Ferrara. Following the sojourn of Clement VIII in Ferrara, he took much of the d’Este collection to Rome. Great Renaissance artists and artwork were reintroduced to Rome, such as Giovanni Bellini’s *Feast of the Gods* and Titian’s *Bacchanals*. These more “classically” styled works were to have considerable importance as templates for the clarity and naturalism of Baroque painting. “Classical” artists, such as Titian and Raphael, would become the favorite collectables of Charles I.

These decorative schemes continued in the ensuing pontificates. Camillio Borghese, Pope Paul V (May 16, 1605-January 28, 1621) is remembered for his warning to Galileo not to hold or defend the heliocentric ideas of Copernicus as “true”. However, Paul V also demonstrated a great love of art and used it as a way to glorify his family and the papacy. St. Peter’s, which had been initiated almost 100 years earlier by Julius II, was not yet complete. Paul V ordered the completion of the project, including the rest of the chapels, additions to the nave that made the church a Latin rather than a Greek cross, the choir, the lower portico, and the upper portico for the papal benediction at St. Peter’s. Paul V’s name is boldly written on the façade of St. Peter’s. It proclaimed that he was “Roman of the Romans.” Using this appeal to classical antiquity,
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69 Jack Freiberg, 176.

70 Catherine Jonston, 17.

71 Even though he actually was not from the city of Rome.
Camillio Borghese (Paul V) announced his standing and importance as a successor to not only St. Peter but also the Roman Imperial legacy. It is important to note James I made this same claim for himself and his successors at the end of Basilikon Doron. Paul V continued his important role in establishing the Baroque aesthetic. He was an avid supporter of the talented Baroque painter Guido Reni, whose clarity and masterful storytelling were renowned in Reni’s own age. Charles pursued Reni, unsuccessfully, as his court painter for this very reason.

Foreign relations were also central to this pontiff. Paul V kept maintained relationships with King Henry IV of France and tried to further better relations with James I. Here he was not as successful. In July 1606, Paul V wrote James, congratulating him on his accession to the throne. Paul asked James to revise the Oath of Allegiance that had been constructed to require Catholics to have allegiance to the king, including religion, after the failed Gunpowder Plot of 1605. Paul and a significant number of English Catholics felt that in good conscience they could not accept the oath as written. When the oath remained unaltered, Paul condemned it twice in written briefs, first in September 1606 and then again in August 1607. The matter was serious enough that it created a division among Catholics in England, which hampered the English Catholic mission, surely to the pleasure of James I. However, even with this said, according to his writings, James feared Catholic disloyalty less than he feared the Puritan unruliness.

72 This claim is proclaimed across the front of St. Peter's and includes the pope’s family name, Borghese, as well as his papal name.

73 James I, “Basilikon Doron” in King James VI and I: Political Writings, Johann P. Sommerville, ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 44. He fancied himself as the emperor of a new “Roman” empire rising in the West, and called his sons Romans.

74 Henry was assassinated by a fanatic in May 1610.

75 This will be a major topic in Chapter 4 through examination of Basilikon Doron. The amount of criticism spent on Puritans is four times the amount spent criticizing Catholics.
One point that the previously mentioned pontiffs and Paul had in common was a shared belief in their own absolute monarchy.\textsuperscript{76} James as the English king often claimed absolute authority in his realms, but in practice, it was never achieved.\textsuperscript{77} Paul V’s inability to achieve some kind of agreement with James was a significant failure of papal policy, however, his work with France and his ability to withstand the power of Spain and Venice left the Papal States in good standing; moreover, his completion of the exterior project of St. Peter’s won him universal acclaim. It was up to his successor, Urban VIII, who reigned for more than twenty years, to complete much of the interior of St. Peter’s along with many other projects in Rome that truly crystallized the absolutist theories of the papacy in stone, paint, and architecture.

Maffeeo Barberini, Urban VIII, ruled the Papal States and tried to rule Catholic Europe from August 6, 1623 to July 29, 1644. He was central to the Baroque Age and to the notion of absolutist art as he began the most important and extensive decorations of the interior of St. Peter’s. He also employed the dazzling architects Bernini, Borromini, and painters such as Guido Reni, Nicholas Poussin, Claude Lorrain and a host of others in these projects. Urban commissioned the Palazzo Barberini, the College of Propaganda, the Fontana del Triton in Piazza Barberini, the Vatican Cathedra and many other prominent structures in the city. Pietro da Cortona embellished the \textit{gran salon} of his family palace with an apotheosis allegory of the \textit{Triumph of the Barberini}, also called \textit{Divine Providence}. In this allegory, his family is celebrated

\textsuperscript{76} Absolutism is the major theme of \textit{Basilikon Doron} and \textit{The Trew Law of Free Monarchies}.

\textsuperscript{77} However, it is interesting to note that Parliament sat in session for only 36 months during his entire reign and a frequent tool James I used was to close parliament when they did not give him what he wanted. Absolutism was only partially achieved in England for the years of Charles I’s personal rule.
as chosen by God to lead the church through Urban. Cortona provided us with a *soto in su* work that dazzles the eyes with lush and luxuriant movement as Urban’s coat of arms, expressed in three huge honeybees, is welcomed into the divine realm. This symbolic apotheosis is clearly similar to the *Apotheosis of James I* on the Banqueting House Ceiling (A-9), in theme if not in execution.

Urban was the last pope to extend the papal territory and was the pope responsible for a mild rapprochement with the English through good relations with the French monarchy and the Queen of England, Henrietta Maria. It was Urban who allowed his servant Bernini to make the glorious *Bust of Charles I*, which survived the ravages of the Civil War, but did not survive a fire at the end of the seventeenth-century. It has been copied in marble by various artists and exists as engravings (A-11 and A-12).

It was during Urban’s reign that the Baroque style became the overpowering style used in Catholic countries around the world, subsequently moving to England directly from the experiences of Inigo Jones and his familiarity with Italy and the great Catholic artists of the Baroque such as Artemisia Gentileschi, Orazio Gentileschi, Peter Paul Rubens, Bernini, and Anthony Van Dyck. All these artists worked directly or indirectly for either the papacy or the Hapsburgs. They were known best for their religious works as well as classical allegories or political works for princes. In particular, Rubens and Bernini, along with Van Dyck, became famous for their portrayals of princes who espoused absolutist theory and helped to synthesize an absolutist Baroque style that emphasized above all else the “virtue of the prince” and divine right to rule. One of the central propositions of this study is that Charles I engaged all of these artists for this very reason--the service of his state--particularly for the aggrandizement of his dynasty and therefore of himself through monumental painting, sculpture and building. This was not
The Hapsburg Court: Philip II and Philip III

For five years, from 1554 to 1558, Philip II was the co-regent King of England and king of much of Europe. If his marriage to Mary Tudor, the oldest daughter of Henry VIII, would have produced an heir, the empire created would have included the most powerful countries of Western Europe. An heir was not produced, and Elizabeth succeeded to the throne in 1558 at Mary’s death. She was not universally recognized, to say the least. Many of the Catholics in England and most of the Catholics outside the country argued that she could not succeed, as the union of her mother to Henry VIII was illegitimate. The Catholic candidate was Mary Queen of Scots (Mary Stuart), the closest “legitimate” relative of Henry VIII. This of course created instant problems between the two cousins and led eventually to the capture and execution of Mary during her own political woes. Mary’s problems stemmed from Calvinists who took control of the monarchy and installed her one-year-old son as king. The execution of Mary Stuart by order of Elizabeth in 1587 brought about a war between England and Spain, which did not end until 1603, after the deaths of both Elizabeth and Philip. This war led to a period of cultural isolation for England. Isolation did not continue after Stuart accession to the throne. The importance of Hapsburg influence on art in the early Stuart period is impressive. What is equally striking is that this fact is underestimated by many English historians and has only been noted by scholars in the last few years.

Another significant fact is the importance of Philip II to the growth of absolutist ideology in Europe. Though he never achieved an absolutist state, he is pivotal to the development of the ideology of Absolutism in early modern Europe through his patronage of artists and philosophers. Many historians now agree that Philip II’s role in the development of the notion of
the “divine right of kings” was definitive. From the beginning of his reign, Philip followed the lead of his father, Charles V. Drawing on the mystic image developed by his father; Philip II manipulated traditional vocabulary to emerge as the master coordinator of the customs associated with divine right. These included a more limited access to the royal person, something Charles I emulated. Philip also had large sums of money to work with in developing art and its use for a propaganda that emphasized his divine right to rule. Philip concentrated on shaping his monarchy in the mold of the unapproachable god-king. He was a master at using iconography that showed the legends of ancient and medieval prophecy: David, Solomon, and other images such as Christian and pagan Roman emperors. Such claims by the Hapsburgs were put into stone, mortar, paint, and gold in the imperial palace-monastery as seen in the engraving of the View of the Escorial (A-13).

With Philip’s inheritance as sovereign of Spain came the New World, the realms of Naples, Sicily, and Lombardy, the titular sovereignty of Jerusalem, and the title of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. Philip’s Spanish heritage was a strong basis, from his point of view, for the claim of a world Christian emperor. Legends of a revival of the imperial days of Rome persisted. Philip used these legends and prophecies fully in the development of his personal and dynastic propaganda.

Philip took as the chief tenet of his monarchy his right to restore the universal rule of the Roman Empire from East to West. He employed an increasingly sophisticated syncretism.

---


79 John H. Elliott, Spain and Its World 1500-1700: Selected Essays (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 152. Elliott maintains that Philip blended Burgundian and Spanish ceremony with papal ceremony to make his kingship more impressive and remote from his subjects.
of classical and Judeo-Christian traditions to achieve this goal, and he shaped his kingship in the mold of the priest-kings of antiquity.  

Philip did this by grounding his family tree in divine and saintly ancestors, such as pagan emperors of Rome, the emperors of Constantinople, and the Frankish kings. Hence, Philip established himself as the most likely heir to pagan and Christian antiquity, a renewed world empire.

In addition, as a corollary to a pseudo-messianic destiny, he identified himself with Solomon and with a “Christianized version of all’antica ancestor worship in the Temple of Jerusalem at the Escorial.” Here he ordered from Titian a series of mythic paintings that extolled his Hapsburg family’s destinies in the manner of the ancient Caesars of Rome. These emphasized the Hapsburg families’ “divinely ordained” victories against Muslims. Charles Stuart would exhibit the exact same kind of display of the pagan Caesars in his palace during his reign, with himself as the natural successor to the Caesars, by incorporating a Van Dyck portrait of himself on horseback as the focal point. Charles begged the Spanish king, Philip III, for these Titians on his visit to Spain. Things went so far that they were packed up and ready for shipment, only to be re-installed at the Escorial when the Spanish match failed.

---

80 Marie Tanner, 143.
81 Marie Tanner, 143.
82 Marie Tanner, 143.
83 Marie Tanner, 143.
84 This parallel will be discussed fully in Chapter 7 dealing with the years of personal rule.
85 Marie Tanner, 142-145.
One of Phillip’s chroniclers, Father Siguenza, recorded the construction of the Escorial and took credit for the library’s iconographical program. He heralded it as a Noah’s Ark, the tabernacle of Moses, and a place where God was just as present as he had been in that other Temple of Solomon, which Phillip II imitated.  

The conformity to Solomon’s temple extends to the combination of royal palace and center of worship in a mortuary context that was intrinsic to model. This intention is expressed in a chronicle of the building prepared for Philp’s heirs by the Escorial prior Fray Francisco de Santos. As Philip had gained the appellation of the second Solomon, it was his royal intention likewise to imitate the Jewish monarch in building an august sepulcher for his father. 

Following this lead, though Charles I did not have the funds or the time to build such an “august sepulcher” for James I, the Banqueting House Ceiling cycle (A-9) acts as such a memorial, a cenotaph.

The Escorial was a model of the “Heavenly Jerusalem” and a sign of God’s blessing on the Spanish empire with its new Solomon. Charles I stayed at this impressive complex in Madrid in his bid for a Spanish match. Rubens also studied the iconographical aspects of the Escorial during his employment by the Hapsburgs. The Escorial was for its age one of the wonders of the world. For the Stuarts, Rubens repeated these same themes, only slightly modified, in the Banqueting House. James was the blessing of God for the English people, founder of the British Empire, the beloved and benevolent “New Solomon” of the British. It is an association that James relished and furthered throughout his own reign.
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86 Fray Joes de Siguenza, *La Fundacion del Monasterio de el Escorial por Filipe II* (Madrid: Aguliar, 1963), ii.

87 Marie Tanner, 167.

88 These parallels will be made apparent with similarities to the Escorial, plans for further work at Whitehall Palace, and the Banqueting House decoration cycle in Chapter 6.
Lucas De Herre created an imposing painting of *Philip II as Solomon* (A-14). Here Philip, seated on the Lion Throne representing Judah, holds his scepter. Philip as the New Solomon receives tribute from the Queen of Sheba, from the New World and other far-flung parts of his empire. He is enthroned like a Caesar. Roman imperial iconography is also present in the headdress of his general on the right of the painting. Philip is portrayed not only as the successor to the legacy of Solomon, but also as inheritor of the Roman/Byzantine tradition started by Constantine the Great, who is claimed as an ancestor of Phillip (and claimed as an ancestor of the Stuarts as well).

The Roman imperial legacy of the Escorial should not go unappreciated. It was expected that Philip II would eventually receive the crown of Holy Roman Emperor, though this expectation was not met. One of the important ideas that a great many people in early modern Europe believed in was the connection of that imperial title to the Parousia. “The pattern was set with the Roman model, and geographic realities aside, no city ever dislodged Rome’s status as the New Jerusalem, the divinely decreed site of Solomon’s rebuilt temple to which Christ would return at the Parousia.”99 This eschatological hope of the “Second Coming” was not confined to Protestant polemics. It was reflected in the literature of early Christianity and the quasi-eschatological place of Rome in the mindset of Western Christianity for much of the Christian era. In this vision, Empire and Christianity were intertwined and inseparable. Philip II bought into this Christianized imperial legacy. He sought to transfer “Rome” to his dominions. As “with Charlemagne at Aachen, with Otto at Treves, with Charles IV at Prague, a new geographic stratification came into being: the New Temple of Jerusalem was rebuilt in transalpine Rome.” Catholic emperors built complexes that were, in one way or another, reflections of the union of

---

99 Marie Tanner, 171.
Solomon’s temple as a model of imperial rule. The propaganda statement made by Charles I in the Banqueting House ceiling (A-9) can be seen in the context of inheriting these imperial traditions.

The Escorial (A-13) was filled with a pervasive blend of sacred architecture and imperial architecture that unifies Old Testament, New Testament, and imperial notions of absolutist kingship.90 Above all, the royal chapel evoked the Holy of Holies and a reconstruction of the heavenly temple. It also served as the most solemn reception site of the monarchy as did the Banqueting House for Charles I. The crypt in the Escorial was a reminder of ancestor worship in a syncretism of Old Testament sources and Roman and Greek practices combined with Christianity, whose spiritual “ancestor worship” was in its veneration of the saints. This kind of veneration of the ancestor was rejected by most of Protestantism during the Reformation, but curiously not so in England.91 Here the life-sized figures of Charles IV and his family along with Phillip II and his family created by Pompeo Leoni (Figure 2-17) kneel in perpetual veneration of God and are witness to the greatness, faith, and imperial heritage of the Hapsburgs.

Philip III, King of Spain, King of Portugal, King of Naples and Sicily, was the next Hapsburg ruler. He succeeded his illustrious/infamous father in 1598 and ruled until 1618. Philip III continued the artistic traditions of his father and the legends of the family’s pedigree. In Arbol Aniciano, dedicated to Philip III when he was a prince, the Cistercian monk Ionne

90 Marie Tanner, 171.
91 It is interesting to note that there was a type of “ancestor veneration” practiced in post-Reformation England. This was political and aimed at establishing “dynastic prowess” rather than anything akin to the veneration of saints. Saint veneration was almost completely wiped out in post-Reformation England with the exception of the cult of St. George, connected closely with the Stuart monarchy. These topics will be discussed in the next chapter, which deals with funeral monuments made during the Elizabethan and early Jacobean periods.
Siefried created a pedigree for the Hapsburgs. These claims went back into antiquity. Siefried maintained in his genealogy that the Hapsburgs’ ancestors included the Trojans, Constantine and Junius Bassus, whose sarcophagus (Figure 2-18) was rediscovered and made famous shortly before the publication of Siefried’s work. This sarcophagus depicted “orthodox” representations of the Savior’s dual nature, the suffering Jesus of the Passion and the ruling Christ as King of the Universe. This famous stone piece emphasized Christ’s rule as God the Father’s regent over earth and gave new inspiration to the Hapsburgs as Christ’s lieutenants and successors to World Empire. This ancient monument and its connection with its original patron helped to support some of Hapsburg’s imperial pretensions.

Philip II’s daughter, like her brother Philip III, continued the use of complex religious and imperial iconography and claims to the Hapsburg family’s pre-Christian and imperial legacy. The tapestries that the Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia had made for the Monastery of the Descalzas in Madrid were a significant commission for Rubens. The Infanta had Rubens portray the tapestries for this church as a combined notion of the triumph of the Eucharist and the triumph of the Hapsburg family. The Victory of Eucharistic Truth over Heresy (Figure 2-19) is an example of Hapsburg use of iconography to identify the family with Catholicism, pre-history, and antiquity. Philip II is prominently figured in the Victory of the Eucharistic Truth (A-16) as one of the champions of Catholicism. One of the most important features in these works is the use of Solomonic columns to invoke religion, virtue and the “divinity” of chosen monarchs. The
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Solomonic columns had been connected with the Eucharist from antiquity.\textsuperscript{94} The inclusion of these columns as architectural frames for each tapestry emphasized the notion of the priest-king. Rubens incorporated this same symbol about divine monarchy in the Stuart cycle.

The political atmosphere conditioned the connections between the art of Spanish princes and English princes. This was a result of the two peace treaties, one during the reign of James and the other during the reign of Charles. It is well documented that more than five hundred Englishmen went to Spain for the signing of the original peace treaty between Philip III and James I. James and Charles’s peace allowed English collectors to scour Madrid and other Spanish dominions for artistic treasures. Ironically, after the English Civil War, the Spanish turned to England to search for artistic treasures amassed by Charles I and by those who supported him during the Civil War\textsuperscript{95}

The amount of time that Charles spent in Spain is imperative to understand his vision of monarchy. During the five and a half months he and the Duke of Buckingham were there on their vain quest for a Spanish match, there is no doubt that, they would have been treated to a “seminar” in royal collecting. It was also a seminar in the use of art by the Hapsburgs. Charles would have seen the splendors not only of the three kings named Philip, but also the treasures amassed by Charles V, Margaret of Austria, Mary of Hungary and other possessions of the family. They also would have seen the collections of royal favorites, aristocrats, and court]

\textsuperscript{94} Connections are made in the following chapters dealing with the Banqueting House and the construction of the Baldacchino by Bernini at the behest of Urban VIII. Rubens and his use of the Solomonic columns in Stuart iconography will be developed further in the same chapter dealing with the Banqueting House.

officials who for more than a century had benefited from posts in Italy, the Netherlands, and Germany. The sight of this wealth of pictures, statues and architecture by so many great masters, most of them religious or political in tenor, had a profound effect on Charles and affected Buckingham as well.

**Conclusion**

The papacy was one of the most significant sources of absolutist art in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. It is clear that the Catholic kings and popes of this era were engaged in themes rooted in Catholic history and the Western imperial tradition. Rulers modeled themselves on Constantine, Charlemagne, or other eastern emperors, or claimed them as ancestors, certain this association would cement their assertion of total power and control of their kingdoms. They also struggled to attach themselves to biblical traditions and icons, such as Solomon or to legends originating from biblical prophecies about empire or the Parousia. In addition, themes of sacraments, especially Eucharistic themes that attached them to the sacrifice of “Christ the King,” were incorporated to validate their position as Christ’s vicar on earth.

The royal collections cited in this chapter were works that contributed to the overall claim of the Hapsburgs as God’s divine right rulers. Though they did not achieve a level of absolute rulership, as did the French, the Spanish kings, Hapsburg emperors, and archdukes led the way in propaganda for this type of government supported by the writings of the Catholic propagandists. Art, as well as literature, was at the center of this dialogue on the European continent. The claims and artistic output of the English monarchy in the late sixteenth-century and the early reign of James I would pale when compared to these sources of divine right propaganda.
Figure 2-1. Cristoforo Roncalli. *Pope Sylvester Baptizes Constantine*, transept, San Giovanni in Laterano. Photo by author.

Figure 2-2. Giovanni Baglione. *Constantine’s Donation to the Lateran*, Transept. San Giovanni in Laterano. Photo by author.
Figure 2-3. Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, Vatican Museum, Vatican City. Photo by author.
CHAPTER 3
THE CHANGING PROTESTANT AESTHETIC:
ENGLISH PROTESTANT TRENDS AND TRADITIONS IN RELIGIOUS ART,
ICONOCLASM, PORTRAITURE, TOMB SCULPTURE AND COLLECTION FROM 1560
TO 1620

Introduction

What was the climate for the use of religious or state art as propaganda by the Stuart
monarchy when James I became king of England 1603? Was his “policy” or use of art or
patronage significantly different from that of Elizabeth’s rule? Was there an official policy for
the use of art in the English Church? Was there a dramatic shift in the reign of King James
toward a more Catholic aesthetic for political as well as religious reasons? These major issues
are examined in this chapter, which will be an exploration of the artistic spectrum of
Protestantism in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in England. Part of the task of
this study is to define general theological viewpoints that existed in this rather unguided and
often contradictory English Protestant view about fine arts and public use of art. One assertion of
this study is that the early Stuarts tried to form some kind of art policy because of the “vacuum”
left by Elizabeth and her lackluster guidance of the Church.

This chapter will examine the importance of John Calvin as the originating source for
iconoclasm and the theological spectrum dominant in this period. I will then describe the
attitudes about art in the middle to late Elizabethan Age. This will include what was considered
appropriate use or what was the lack of use of religious art and imagery for church and state. A
narrative well then follow of some uses of art by James in his early reign. Included in this
discussion are tombs erected for Elizabeth I and Mary Queen of Scotts (Figures 1-1, 1-2, 1-3)
located in Westminster Abbey. I will also briefly describe the influences that helped move
English thought toward a visual culture and then offer conclusions.
Calvin’s Influence on Religious Imagery

From the beginning of the reign of Edward VI, Calvin influenced most of the important religious minds of the first generation of the English Reformation. The English Reformation, like many German territorial reformations, was first an act of the state. In reality, England was like no other country except perhaps Sweden in that the rupture from Rome came so thoroughly by the workings of the monarchy. The theological orientation of the Church of England was of the Reformed tradition, not Lutheranism, and was essentially fixed during the short reign of Edward VI (1547-53). Edward and his ministers followed the teachings of John Calvin on the rejection of religious imagery, on the symbolic understanding of the sacraments, and on the apocalyptic nature of the papacy as the root and expression of the evil of their age. Because of this Calvinist underpinning, and the union of Church and State through the monarchy, the use of imagery was complicated during this period. Imagery was much more prevalent and connected with Catholicism.

Calvin’s rejection of religious imagery was close to total in his writings, with the exception of copying nature as homage to the Creator. Calvin validates some, but not all, works of art that deal with history painting or portraiture. Even these artistic forms could lead to the sin of avarice and pride. One point is clear through a close examination of Calvin’s writings: Art had no value in the pedagogical effort in religion. For those who followed Calvin’s thought process about art as valueless as a teaching tool in religion, it is not a stretch to imagine that it might also be insignificant for teaching the important civic/theology of early modern England about monarchy, especially Absolutism which was at its very center a religious theory. The fact that the king was head of church and the notion that the king was God’s special agent would complicate the use of the king’s image in any religious or quasi-religious works for Calvinists.
This might explain the reality that no great history cycles were painted during the reign of the
later Tudors. Their contribution focused on portraiture.

In his *Institutes*, Calvin described the correct use and place of art.

And yet I am not gripped by the superstition of thinking absolutely no images permissible. But because sculpture and painting are gifts of God, I seek a pure and legitimate use of each, lest those things which the Lord has conferred upon us for his glory and our good be not only polluted by perverse misuse but also turned to our destruction. We believe it wrong that God should be represented by a visible appearance, because he himself has forbidden it [Ex. 20:4]….Therefore it remains that only those things are to be sculptured or painted which the eyes are capable of seeing: let not God's majesty, which is far above the perception of the eyes, be debased through unseemly representations. Within this class some are histories and events, some are images and forms of bodies without any depicting of past events. The former have some use in teaching or admonition; as for the latter, I do not see what they can afford other than pleasure. And yet it is clear that almost all the images that until now have stood in churches were of this sort. From this, one may judge that these images had been called forth not out of judgment or selection but of foolish and thoughtless craving. I am not saying how wickedly and indecently the greater part of them have been fashioned, how licentiously the painters and sculptors have played the wanton here--a matter that I touched upon a little earlier. I only say that even if the use of images contained nothing evil, it still has no value for teaching.¹

Much of history painting, biblical stories, God, angels, virtues or saints are off limits in the
theory of Calvin’s art world. Even as Calvin allows for the creation of sculpture and paintings, he restricted them severely. For Calvin most religiously themed art was within the category of the forbidden: “one may judge that these images had been called forth not out of judgment or selection but of foolish and thoughtless craving.” There is not much room for a true “godly” believer or follower of Calvin’s thought to embrace art even in a limited way for pedagogical purpose by using the *Institutes* as a basis.

Calvin’s theological and philosophical vision of art led to major iconoclastic outbreaks throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This anti-imagery theology took root early

in the Calvinist wing of the English Church, a wing that many historians have taken for granted as the largest and most influential part of the English Church. This factor alone is important to note as a backdrop to the arguments of this paper. Therefore, it is essential to grapple with Calvin’s total rejection of an intellectual argument for the spiritual, or worship-aid use of imagery, or the notion that religious imagery could instruct the faithful about any religious concepts. Of equal importance to this discussion is that Arminians and anti-Calvinists would later disagree with Calvin’s thoughts and biblical exegesis. They argue for a more Catholic, pre-reformation use of art, as in the shared history of the Roman and Eastern churches in arts use as propaganda, worship, and instructions sake.²

Religious Conflict about the Use of Art

English “conflicts about and innovations in church polity, doctrine, and practical piety generated by this mix would prove exceptionally important to the history of the Reformed churches throughout Europe—all the more so in that, with its total population of 2.75 million people in 1541 and more than 4 million in 1600, England was the largest country whose national

² Throughout this paper, evidence will be given that the near total rejection of the use of imagery for ecclesial purposes hampered the monarchy in the use of imagery, until the notion was challenged somewhat vigorously by James, in the latter part of his reign, for political purposes. Charles and the Arminian wing of the English Church—-for religious and political purposes to extol the value and importance of the monarchy—-further devalued Calvinist abhorrence for religious art and decoration. It is my contention that their use of art in many ways cannot be distinguished from the use of art by Catholics on the continent, thus the use of art by Arminians and anti-Calvinists was an obvious and important friction for the pro-Calvinist wing of the English Church and those who would later separate entirely from Anglicanism. With the Stuart monarchy’s embracing of Absolutism as their core justification to rule as God’s appointed lieutenant, their use of religious and imperial iconography was indeed different from the use by Elizabeth and was more in tandem with the Catholic monarchies. These monarchies used art in this service to further Catholicism and their own right to rule as absolutes. James would begin to use art in the same way as these Catholic monarchies, and Charles would use the greatest aficionado’s Baroque style to further his own personal Absolutism as no English monarch had or would ever do again.
church took on Reformed hues.”³ This is the estimation of Philip Benedict who argues in his recent study of Calvinism. He noted that England’s position as a primarily Calvinist church is contested today between two groups of revisionist historical groups.

The religious history of sixteenth-century England has been largely rewritten in the past generation by two movements of revisionist scholarship. The first, associated with Christopher Haigh, J. J. Scarisbrick, and Eamon Duffy, has wanted to exorcise the ghosts of the Protestant national myth that equated the cause of the Reformation with the will of the people. The sequence of religious changes implemented by England's monarchs from Henry VIII to Elizabeth I, they stress, was anything but the necessary consequence of a contemporaneous upsurge of evangelical sentiment among a population alienated from the late medieval church. On the contrary, change was imposed from above on a largely hostile or indifferent populace. The second movement, associated especially with Patrick Collinson, Nicholas Tyacke, and Peter Lake, has more gradually and less polemically undercut the long-established projection onto the first generations of the Elizabethan and Jacobean church of the Church of England's later self-image as a distinctive church tradition representing a via media between Catholicism and continental Protestantism. A salient Anglican theological tradition of this sort did emerge in the wake of the Reformation, these historians would agree, but not until the last decade of the sixteenth century; it did not come to dominate the church until some point in the seventeenth. Prior to that time, the church drew its theological inspiration from continental theology and was fundamentally Reformed in outlook.

This second reinterpretation is particularly convincing because it has broken free of the insularity that characterizes so much English historiography and situated its subject within the range of contemporary European possibilities. The same is less true of the early Tudor revisionists, who display a much more limited awareness of the larger world of European Reformation scholarship and of its implications for their topic.⁴

These contemporary arguments about the process of the Reformation both point out a considerable amount of conflict was generated regarding the nature of what should be preserved from the medieval English Church or jettisoned by the series of reformations begun in the sixteenth-century and continued into the seventeenth-century. However, the English monarchy looked toward Europe for its art, architecture and form of government, Absolutism. Scholars


⁴Philip Benedict, 132.
such as Patrick Collinson, Nicholas Tyacke, and Peter Lake argued for a more connected and continentally influenced English development. In following chapters, I will argue that the influence of Catholicism also could be seen in a wider European context, and the movement of James and Charles in politics, religion and art was made to make England less insular and in tandem with the rest of Europe and its majority religion.

One of the problems the Stuart monarchy confronted was the polity of the English Church and its majority Calvinist theological underpinning at the beginning of the reign of James I. It resisted the openness reflected in Stuart policy toward the tradition of the medieval church on ceremony and imagery. Calvin’s adamant teaching in the Institutes explicitly rejected this ceremony and imagery. Calvin argued:

Meanwhile, since this brute stupidity gripped the whole world to paint after visible figures of God, and thus to form gods wood, stone, gold, silver, or other dead and corruptible matter we must cling to this principle: God's glory is corrupted by impious falsehood whenever any form is attached to him. Therefore in the law, after having claimed for himself alone the glory of deity, when he would teach what worship he approves or repudiates, God soon adds, "You shall not make for yourselves graven image, nor any likeness" [Ex. 20:4]. By these words he restrains our waywardness from trying to represent him by a visible image, and briefly enumerates all those forms by which superstition long ago began to turn his truth into falsehood. For know that the Persians worshiped the sun; all the stars they saw in the heavens the stupid pagans also fashioned into gods themselves. There was almost no animal that for the Egyptian was not figure of a god. Indeed, the Greeks seemed be to wise above the rest, because they worshiped God in human form. But God does not compare these images with one another, as if one were more suitable, another less so; but with exception he repudiates all likenesses, pictures, and other signs by which the superstitious have thought he will be near them.5

Calvin calls those who are not in agreement with him: stupid, idolaters, corrupt, pagan and ignorant of God’s will for man. Imagery of anything connected with the divine will also be challenged. This is particularly important, as the king was the “image” of the ruler of heaven in

most absolutist thought. The incorporeal must not be made corporal. He is emphatic in the
notion that the spiritual is superior to the carnal or created order. Every statue of God or Christ is
therefore an abomination in his theological point of view because one cannot make the spiritual
into the carnal.\footnote{John Calvin, 100-101} Calvin gives very little cover for religious material culture in any Calvinistic
centered ecclesiology.\footnote{It would also be problematic because of the religious climate in England for the king to
image the divine order as expressed in the contemporary explanations of Absolutism including
Basilikon Doron. This will be an important discussion in the following Chapter.}

He argued against any kind of an appeal to the notion of incarnation theology. This
theology was especially prevalent in the late Middle Ages and in the Renaissance and was
emphasized in Tridentine Catholicism by such authors as Paleotti and Borromeo as the major
motivation for religious art. Though Calvin does not deny the incarnation and that God had
shown himself in the material, in the flesh, and in history, he argued that direct signs of the
divine presence were not enough for him to justify any religiously themed artworks.

God, indeed, from time to time showed the presence of his divine majesty by definite
signs, so that he might be said to be looked upon face to face. But all the signs that he ever
gave forth aptly conformed to his plan of teaching and at the same time clearly told men of
his incomprehensible essence. For clouds and smoke and flame [Deut. 4: 11], although
they were symbols of heavenly glory, restrained the minds of all, like a bridle placed on
them, from attempting to penetrate too deeply….The Holy Spirit appeared under the
likeness of a dove [Matt. 3: 16]. Since, however, he vanished at once, who does not see
that by one moment's symbol the faithful were admonished to believe the Spirit to be
invisible in order that, content with his power and grace, they might seek no outward
representation for themselves? For the fact that God from time to time appeared in the
form of a man was the prelude to his future revelation in Christ. Therefore the Jews were
absolutely forbidden so to abuse this pretext as to set up for themselves a symbol of deity
in human form.

The mercy seat from which God manifested the presence of his power under the law
was so constructed as to suggest that the best way to contemplate the divine is where
minds are lifted above themselves with admiration. Indeed, the cherubim with wings
outspread covered it; the veil shrouded it; the place itself deeply enough hidden concealed
it [Ex. 25:17-21]. Hence it is perfectly clear that those who try to defend images of God and the saints with the example of those cherubim are raving mad-men.8

By using arguments from the Old Testament, Calvin concluded that God wanted to be always veiled in mystery rather imaged. Contemporary Catholic art reformers such as Paleotti and Borromeo argued that Calvin interpretations were wrong and the issue was not so black and white.

Calvin argued that humanity had a natural affinity toward idolatry, which can be traced to the thoroughly corrupt nature of man. This section argues the ignorance of the Orthodox as well as Catholic Church. He wrote:

Those who trust in them become like them [PS. 115: 8; cf. Ps. 113b:8, Vg.]. But we must note that a "likeness" no less than a "graven image" is forbidden. Thus is the foolish scruple of the Greek Christians refuted. For they consider that they have acquitted themselves beautifully if they do not make sculptures of God, while they wantonly indulge in pictures more than any other nation. But the Lord forbids not only that a likeness be erected to him by a maker of statues but that one be fashioned by any craftsman whatever, because he is thus represented falsely and with an insult to his majesty. 9

Calvin’s rejection of imagery was so sever that stained glass was idolatrous. His greatest attack on images and the Catholic church is reserved in section seven of the Institutes:

Therefore, if the Papists have any shame, let them henceforward not use this evasion, that pictures are the books of the uneducated, because it is plainly refuted by very many testimonies of Scripture. Even if I were to grant this, yet they would not thus gain much to defend their idols. It is well known that they set monstrosities of this kind in place of God. The pictures or statues that they dedicate to saints—what are they but examples of the most abandoned lust and obscenity? If anyone wished to model himself after them, he would be fit for the lash. Indeed, brothels show harlots clad more virtuously and modestly than the churches show those objects which they wish to be thought images of virgins. For martyrs they fashion a habit not a whit decent. Therefore let them compose their idols at least to more moderate decency, that they may with a little more modesty falsely claim that these are books of some holiness! 10

---


9 John Calvin, 104-105.
This section concludes with a striking criticism of the type of religious art being produced in the middle part of the sixteenth-century, the high point of Mannerism. At this point Calvin lamented that art was overly sensual. The insight of some of his biographers may be helpful to understand his visceral reaction to the later artworks of Michelangelo and the Mannerists of Calvin’s day. According to William J. Bouwsma, the body was an extremely difficult thing for Calvin to appreciate. He noted of Calvin, “lowest of all is the body, the primary source of human wickedness, and Calvin suggested that God had displayed his own disdain for it by creating it from the dust in order to keep us humble. It is the body, he wrote, that prevents us from recognizing God as the source of order in human affairs.”

Thoughts of the body, especially when associated with sexuality, could produce in his rhetoric sudden reversals in which he would switch within a single paragraph from wonder at the miracle of human procreation to a sense of the body as “ordure and contagion” and the procreative act as “a shameful thing one dares not mention.” This conventional and unbiblical attitude to the body may have had deep roots in Calvin’s own feelings. “There is something so unaccountably shameful in the nakedness of man,” he [Calvin] remarked, “that scarcely anyone dares too look upon himself, even when no witness is present.” This attitude also gave him theological difficulties.

This disgust of the human form and lack of appreciation of the nude certainly made imagery an obstacle for him. His disdain for the created-flesh also helped to inform his distancing from the traditional sacramental formulas of the ancient and medieval church in which the church believed that sacraments were outward signs working in the “material” world of God’s inward grace. His lack of respect for the material world explained his reasoning and understanding sacraments as only “spiritual” manifestations that confirm election while not truly

10 John Calvin, 106-107.


12 William J. Bouwsma, 80.
Calvin’s lack of disregard for the human form might also explain his apprehension of the use of images of the Incarnation, God-made-flesh. His dualism between spiritual and physical at times seemed to approach Manichean or Gnostic ideas about the duality of the spiritual and the material spheres.

Calvin was harsh and clear about associating any kind of reverence toward locality, such as a shrine or holy place connected with an individual saint or image. For Calvin there is no room for veneration of relics or place or for the veneration of artworks connected with miracles. Many shrines were attacked in England with ferocity. Local saints and their shrines were damaged during sporadic iconoclastic incidents, including St. Thomas Becket’s, which was destroyed by order of Henry VIII. Many more shrines were damaged or destroyed during the reign of Edward VI and from time to time during the reign of Elizabeth.

Those who assert that this was not done heretofore, and within our memory is still not being done, lie shamelessly. For why do they prostrate themselves before these things? Why do they, when about to pray, turn to them as if to God’s ears?....Why do they tire themselves out with votive pilgrimages to see images whose like they have at home? Why do they take up the sword to defend these images today as if they were altars and hearth fires, even to the point of butchery and carnage, and more easily bear being deprived of the one God then of their idols? Nevertheless, I do not yet enumerate the crass errors of the multitude, which are well-nigh infinite, and which occupy the hearts of almost all men; I am only indicating what they profess when they especially wish to exculpate themselves of idolatry. We do not call them “our gods,” they say. Neither did Jews nor pagans of old so speak of them, and yet the prophets did not hesitate repeatedly to accuse them of fornication with wood and stone.13

Calvin showed a disdain for any association with pilgrimage, also a disdain for common folk as ignorant and easily led to such folly. This is in disagreement with the writings of slightly later Catholic apologists such as Paleotti or Borromeo who thought image was the most expedient way to connect religion the multitudes.

13 John Calvin, 110-11.
For Calvin, the greatest breakers of God’s laws and injunctions against idolatry or religious imagery were the Catholics or those who supported the notion of the use of image for religious purposes. It is also clear from his rhetoric that those who chose to follow their “corrupt” and “idolatrous” ways were no better than Catholics themselves. Do Calvin’s teachings about rejection of the use of art to mirror or illustrate the divine within the church also have implications for following English monarchs who attempted to demonstrate a divinely instated monarchy? Yes, if a king thought that he was “the image” of the King of heaven and a personal lieutenant, then such images would be idolatry. Many made such a criticism during the early Stuart period.¹⁴

Legacy of Calvin in Elizabethan England

In retrospect, Henry VIII did little more than reject papal authority, decree royal supremacy over the English Church, initiate localized iconoclasm, and steal a great amount of ecclesiastical property in his “reform.” Edward moved the church and its practice in a patently Reformed direction. Worship was only partly shorn of the Catholic practices that most other Reformed churches rejected as unbiblical. The Catholic interlude of Mary I led Elizabeth to hold to a modified and more conservative Edwardian settlement as the best way to bring stability in an increasingly polarized religious situation. But advancing Protestants tried to revive the “unfinished business” of Edward’s reign and continued to challenge royal authority during Elizabeth’s rule. These further reforms or innovations were rooted in the ever-pervasive teachings of John Calvin. Through the first three decades of Elizabeth’s reign, successive waves of religious agitation, which sought to make and move the English Church truly within Calvin’s

¹⁴ This notion will be explored fully along with the detractors of James, but particularly Charles in the following Chapters.
Reformed tradition. Further reform included calls for a Presbyterian form of church government, the abandonment of the office of bishop, clear theological statements about the symbolic nature of the sacraments and the removal of all religiously offensive artwork according to the new anti-image tradition established by Calvin.

Elizabeth at times seemed to be uninterested in the church as long as her personal piety or prerogative was not questioned. It is only in the late 1580s and 1590s that Elizabeth suppressed multiple Presbyterian movements. However, her repression of the movements toward further reformation did not protect her or her successor’s regimes from continued criticism in the press and from many preachers who continually called for further reforms and removal of more images. The English Church remained a predominantly Reformed, indeed, Calvinist church in its theological teachings and orientation even with its mingle-mangle of austere doctrines, unreformed ecclesial courts, canon law, administrative hierarchies and half-reformed rituals.

**English Distrust of Imagery**

Those who adhered to strict Calvinism taught, “much of the suspicion surrounding monumental images was that they were comprehended through the sense of sight; and sight was not thought altogether trustworthy.”¹⁵ Often for these anti-imagery theoreticians there was a tendency to see sight as a feminine sense that also led to certain mistrust if representation.¹⁶ According to Nigel Llewellyn, the fear of the visual as a feminine attribute was grounded in the general patriarchal fear of woman. Women were an uncontrolled allure, which was also


¹⁶ Llewellyn, 242-243.
important in the notion of the idolatry of the “visual”. Bishop Cleland in sermons and letters warned the young grand tourists against “enjoying of the visual stimuli of Catholic Europe and of wasting time on fixing their vision on the fine marble in Italy.” One of the consistent themes in reformist moralizing literature was to distrust the eye. Reformer William Clarke in his works condemned the images of Catholicism as “all for the eye...to snare the heart of a carnal man, bewitching it with so great glistening of the painted harlot.”

For the true adherents of Calvinism, “Gods worship is in Spirit & trueth; and poperies is in gold and silver & pearle, and crucifixes, and Agnus deis all for the eye, and to share the heart of a carnall man, bewitching it with so great glistening of the painted harlot.” Cosmetics also covered the truth, distorted the natural look of women, and thereby distorted the handiwork of God by wrapping it in vanity. Many examples of women being compared to a “baser mettle” or being “gilded like statues”. One such work is by Thomas Tuke who commented on cosmetics, of poisoning and murder, of pride and ambition, and has one chapter in his work named “The picture of a Picture or the character of a painted woman.” Art and deception are linked in the

17 Llewellyn 243.


19 Llewellyn, 243.

20 William Charke, *An answere to a seditious pamphlet lately cast abroade by a Iesuite conteyning ix. articles heere inserted and set downe at large, with a discouerie of that blasphemous sect. By William Charke* (Imprinted at London: By Christopher Barker, printer to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie, Anno 1581), B.viii.

21 Thomas Tuke, *A discourse against painting and tincturing of women Wherein the abominable sinnes of murther and poysoning, pride and ambition, adultery and witchcraft are set forth & discovered. Whereunto is added The picture of a picture, or, the character of a painted woman* (Imprinted at London: By Thomas Creede and Bernard Alsop for Edward Marchant, 1616).
minds of many of those who followed Calvin’s theological premises, and they are linked to essentially feminine attributes of “fallen nature,” which can be traced as far back as Eve and the apple as models of feminine deception.

Even the use of color was fraud according to Calvin’s thoughts. He noted how color was used for deceit and allure, “wypping away all deceitful color, shoulde set them forth to be seen of the simple shuche as they be.”\(^2^2\) The use of enhanced color in art hid the natural surfaces of God’s creation. This ornamentation aroused the notion of an obscuring quality to hide the Creator’s original intentions. Replication of nature then was allowable as an art form but the enhancement to deceive or make more beautiful than the original creation was at the very least not genuine and at the worst, dangerous ruse.

Because of these multiple fears raised by these critics of art, William Harrison, a court preacher and anti-Catholic, noted that the work of English yeomen was “merry without malice, and plain without inward Italian or French craft and subtlety.”\(^2^3\) To be influenced by the Italian or the French was to be identified with popery and its subtle, corrupting forces. Plain work that echoed the Creator was acceptable as long as it did not reflect the artistic tastes of the continent and remained simple repetition of nature.

These critics of art were correct in their notions of deception in art. Single point perspective, the illusion of depth, even the notion of idealism was in itself a type of deception. Technical “sleights of the hand” were used to create works intentionally to fool the eye. Often

\(^{2^2}\) Jean Calvin, The institution of Christian religion, vvrytten in Latine by maister Ihon Caluin, and translated into Englysh according to the authors last edition. Seen and allowed according to the order appointed in the Quenes maiesties iniunctions (Imprinted at London: By Reinolde VVolfe & Richarde Harison, Anno. 1561), 148.

stone was painted by English masons to appear as bronze. Numerous examples of these types of works appear throughout England for the obvious reason that stone was cheaper. This kind of technical deception was more evident in painting and was a problem for those who distrusted images in general. In his diary written in 1603-1604, John Manningham observed, “The divel, like those painters which are skillful in the art of perspective, taketh pleasure, by false coulurs and deceitful shadowes, to make those things seeme farthest of which are nerest of hand.”

The stage arts were not immune to criticism by the commentators of the day. Though the Elizabethan and Jacobean ages were noted for their love and patronage of theater, there was ample criticism of this art form by “true believers.” By the time of the English Civil War, Thomas Fuller, a critic of the arts as well as the Stuart monarchy assessed that plays and masques “shews [not] substance, marking alone Pagents, Pictures, beautiful Buildings etc.,” and the stage in particular should be avoided by English either at home or in travels for “goodness is not portrayed out with equall accents of liveliness as the wicked things are.” Even Shakespeare was banned in the years of the interregnum as decadent and subversive. The common thread about all arts connected to image, from the strictest view of the adherents of Calvinism--was that art was deceptive and could and would most likely lead to idolatry.

---


25 Thomas Fuller, *The holy state* (Cambridge: Printed by R.D. for John Williams, 1648), 158. This is a second edition work originally printed in 1642.

26 Thomas Fuller, 185.

27 Jack Lynch, *Becoming Shakespeare: The Unlikely Afterlife that Turned a Provincial Playwright into the Bard* (New York: Walker, 2007). Jack Lynch, in one of the most recent scholarly treatments of Shakespeare, notes that during the English Civil War, all plays, including Shakespeare’s, were banned by the triumphant Puritans because of what was considered their lascivious, immoral content.
Calvinism in Protestant Europe and Its Effects on English Image

Much unease arose in the English Church about continued use of the religious buildings inherited from its Catholic past. The continuity of worship could be justified on financial and practical grounds but as Archbishop Whitgift admitted in 1574, “Many be offended with our churches, and will neither hear sermon nor receive the sacraments in them.” The position of Elizabethan separatists, such as John Penry, and Henry Barrow or the Commonwealth sectarians such as Samuel Chidley, was uncompromising. They argued that the old Catholic church buildings were wholly unacceptable even if they were stripped of their ornaments and popery. The orientation, shape, and structure were intrinsically idolatrous and they had to be leveled and begun again. Some English looked outside of England for something different.

There were Protestant models. Calvinism influenced the artwork and architecture of France and the Low Countries. These countries were the most important examples of Calvinist theory put into practice. Protestants from England encountered these prototypes in their travels. Though France was never in serious danger of becoming Protestant, many tumultuous years of struggle existed between Catholic forces and Huguenots. Philip Benedict noted that the effect of the reformed tradition on religious imagery was usually negative in both of these areas.

Inside such Huguenot-controlled cities as Rouen and Orleans, events followed a pattern that would be repeated a decade later in many parts of the Low Countries. Initially, the new Protestant masters proclaimed a commitment to religious toleration and allowed


Catholic worship to continue. Soon the polarizing effects of warfare swept aside the voices of moderation. The churches were purified of their altars and statues in great waves of iconoclasm. Catholic services ceased as priests fled in fear for their lives.30

Iconoclasm was an effect of the Reformation in both France and the Low Countries. However, one exception for the use of representation was the press in such works as *The Overturning of the Great Marmite* (A-17). As in England, the graphic arts were used extensively in the Protestant cause. There were positive uses of the arts and architecture employed by Calvinists in France. After the Edict of Nantes granted in 1598 Protestants liberty of conscience along with freedom of worship there emerged, until the revocation of the Edict, the development of Protestant architecture and furnishings in Protestant areas of France. Prime examples of these “temples” erected, outside of the city limits usually, such as *The Temple of Charenton* (A-18) which originally built in 1606 and rebuilt after 1621, and the *Temple of Bourg-L’Abbe*’ (A-19) which was finished in 1612.

The Temple of Charenton was a large structure that used an elongated nave and various levels of galleries as a modified basilica for optimum hearing of the Word. Salmon de Brosse (designer of the Luxembourg Place for Marie de Medici) designed the replacement temple. “Its symbolic place as the temple for the Parisian community, and the spread of the design beyond France assured the Charenton temple of enormous prestige and elevated it in some ways to the position of the ideal temple or, more appropriately, the ideal of the Protestant temple.”31 These French Protestant churches exemplified “extreme simplicity, some of the these structures can be
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effectively compared, if not to the ‘barn’ so disdained by the Catholics, at least to models in use for local civil architecture and adopted to the needs of Protestant worship.”32

The temple of Bourg-l’Abbe’ at Caen (A-19) was in the form of a central plan. It had a two-tiered roof, a small tower for a bell, and a lantern at each end. As in the temple of Charenton (A-20), the interior had “no visual or acoustical obstacle [that] stood between preacher and congregation.”33 “The first order of business for architects and contractors was to create a structural arrangement that would be well suited to the sermon service, that most important and elementary feature of Reformed worship. They [architects] strove to eliminate any possible obstacle between preacher and congregation.”34 Decoration of these temples was severe. Ornament did vary somewhat from church to church. It usually included the coat of arms of the local elite, municipal arms, or royal arms. The only religious decorations were biblical inscriptions, and there was usually a Decalogue Board (A-21).35 The Huguenots followed Calvin’s exhortation on the arts to the letter that no representations of the divinity, saints, or angelic figures were to be located in the place of worship.

Another important country that involved many Englishmen in trade as well as religious sympathy was The Netherlands. This Country tried to gain religious and political freedom from Hapsburg dominion during the second half of the sixteenth-century and much of the early seventeenth-century. The Netherlands, as with England, was a reformation from the top down with limited support for the Protestant minority who gradually gained majority status. The

32 Helene Guicharnaud, 141.
33 Helene Guicharnaud, 141.
34 Helene Guicharnaud, 153.
35 Helene Guicharnaud, 154.
character of the Netherlands reform must be put in context of a more widely influenced reform.

Calvinism in the Netherlandic context, particularly for the period prior to the Synod of Dort, needs to be seen in a more inclusive understanding of the term “Reformed” as

The Netherlands had an indigenous reformation under way well before Jean Calvin turned from Catholic to Protestant. In the early years of the sixteenth-century the reformation movement in the Netherlands was fed by local theologians—Erasmus not least among them—then informed by other theologians, particularly Martin Luther.36

Thus Calvinism did gain an upper hand as the underpinning of the Netherlandic Reformation, especially in iconoclastic activity, something Erasmus would condemned as a lover of not only art but church art as well. Luther also would have been unimpressed with their destructive zeal.

One exception for the use of image in instruction was polemical texts. Hendrick Goltzius’s work Christ’s Fulfillment of 1578 (A-22) illustrated the combination of the Word and Image. This was a common type of graphic art used in instructional books in the Netherlands. It confronted Calvin’s notion that image was not useful for teaching. Hendrick Hondius with his work Papist Pyramid (A-23), circa 1599, is typical of the anti-papal tradition combining fierce attack and diabolical illustration of Catholicism during the Netherlandish civil wars. Literature could be enhanced with art to teach an ideology.

Dutch illustrations of the period are also helpful in documenting the movement toward the Calvinist aesthetic for church decoration. Jan Wierix did a series of illustrations centering on reformation piety. Give Us This Day our Daily Bread (A-24) is a description of a Reformed congregation listening to a sermon, the bread of the spirit. In the background is a man at a table
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giving thanks for real bread. The action is set in a Catholic church, complete with an altar in the background where a priest celebrates the Mass. The church is decorated in the traditional Catholic fashion with statues and a high altar where a crucifix dominates the scene. In his second edition of the work (A-25), the church was stripped of all offending art and the priest is replaced by a minister, a communal table, and a plain wall behind it. Though Calvinism “certainly did not impede the flowering of seventeenth-century art in Holland, nor did it ever intend to do so. Calvinists were opposed to religious altarpieces and representation of anything associated with the divine, which they had banished from their own circles.”

Further examples of the banishment of religious art are numerous during the period of 1560-1630 in the Netherlands. One case study is St. Bavo’s in Haarlem. St. Bavo’s (Figure 3-1), was erected as a typical northern Gothic cathedral encrusted with decoration, statuary and splendid stained glass windows. These Catholic decorations were expunged from this important building in the late sixteenth and early seventh century. Paintings “were banned from the main body of the church, the interior was nevertheless enriched with ornate choir screen, pulpits, and tombs. In addition, costly stained glass windows that had not served a liturgical purpose were retained, provided they did not contain any overtly Catholic motifs.” Examples of such removals are typified by St. Bavo. “In St. Bavo in Haarlem, the glass panels depicting the Trinity and the donor, Joris van Egmond, bishop of Utrecht, were removed from the large window designed by Barent van Orley. In or around 1595 they were replaced by scenes illustrating an
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38 Ilja M. Veldman, 412.
episode from Haarlem’s history; the augmentation of the city’s coat of arms by Emperor Frederic II.”

Other examples of iconoclasm in churches were chronicled in Frans Hogenberg’s Iconoclasm of 1566 (A-27). Iconoclasts pull down statues, break offending windows, hacks apart an altarpiece, and tear up ecclesiastical garments. One of the captions reads, “after a little preaching of the Calvinist religion”. Most of the great churches of the northern Netherlands were treated this way by 1600. An examination of the Interior of St. Bavo’s Haarlem (A-26) shows that all “offending” art had been removed from this former cathedral no longer known as St. Bavo’s, but after the cleansing, the “Great Church.”

A “plain style,” exemplified by the French innovations and the Dutch stripping of artwork seems to have been absorbed and imitated by the English in a few English chapels that were constructed in the early 1600s. Protestant books illustrating the architecture and decorative habits of fellow Protestants and Calvinist leaning-churches made it to England. In addition, the expanding travel of the English aristocracy and merchant classes, after the peace with Spain, brought them into direct contact with these designs of churches in France and the Netherlands.

Several examples of these English “plain style” buildings are Langley Chapel, Shropshire, constructed circa 1601 (A-28) and Toxteth Chapel, Liverpool, 1604 (A-29, A-30, A-31). Other examples no longer exist or their decorations and redesigns do not allow historians a clear

39 Ilja M. Veldman, 412.

40 Philip Benedict, Christ’s Churches Purely Reformed, 183.

41 I have visited St. Bavo’s on several occasions. It is even starker without people in the building, as shown in the paintings from the seventeenth-century, and it still looks much the same as it did when painted in the 1640s.
picture of their original constructions or revetments. Puritans who sought to remain in the established English Church designed or redecorated buildings, such as Langley Chapel, with simple rectangular elegance in stone. The building initially had a structural chancel. It was oriented in the traditional medieval manner with a priest’s door at the south side. The interior was arranged so communicants could sit around a simple table. The table is very small and could not serve many. The rest of the church was used as an auditory. Christopher Stell noted the communion kneelers were likely an addition after the restoration and not in the original.\(^\text{42}\) The simplicity of this chapel is stark being devoid of any decoration, including stained glass.

Another less modest building is Toxteth Chapel, Liverpool. This chapel’s first minister was Richard Mather, who reluctantly accepted ordination in the English Church to minister to his congregation. “Mather was accused of unorthodox practices, omitting the sign of the cross in baptism, and failing to administer the sacrament to communicants kneeling. In 1635 he followed the footsteps of many of his fellow Puritans and set sail for the New World.”\(^\text{43}\) His chapel at Toxteth still stands (A-29, A-30, A-31) relatively undisturbed though the walls were raised in the eighteenth century and a larger entrance was added at that time.\(^\text{44}\) This chapel illustrates what will become “the typical eighteenth-century meetinghouse layout, with the pulpit against a longer side wall.”\(^\text{45}\) It would be for those who eventually left the English Church to wipe away


\(^{43}\) Christopher Stell, 54. It has been estimated that between twenty and thirty thousand religious dissidents immigrated to the New England colonies between 1620 and 1642.

\(^{44}\) Christopher Stell, 56.

\(^{45}\) Christopher Stell, 56.
completely all of the old popish holdovers such as cancels, communion rails, religious art and kneeling at communion.

**Pressures against Image in Elizabethan England**

Within a short time of her accession, Elizabeth began to dismantle some of the reconstruction of ecclesiastical decoration and furnishings of churches reinstated by her sister Mary I. According to Margaret Aston, Marian Catholics had not just restored the familiar face of English parish churches before Edward, but they countered in the most positive manner the image-denying Protestants. In the church of Mary I, the “crucifix was to be blazoned in the centre of the church; the cult of the local saint was physically restated. Old, faded and diminutive carvings would not meet the new standards. The statues were to be large and ablaze with color. It was a time when many aging craftsmen found themselves back in demand, a time for burnishing rusty tools.”

These tools, largely, would be laid to rest until the advent of the Stuarts.

There were many who were happy with this change [return to the Catholic past] comforted by the return of accustomed sight. Yet things could never be the same again. The restored cross and crucifix, church patron, and adorned altar now held a new significance. These were dogmatic response to the iconoclasts and a speaking of the teachings of the church in the layman’s painted book.

“Whatever else Mary’s brief reign accomplished, it surely brought home to many parishioners the state of flux in things religious. Who can not doubt that the faiths of Word and Image were
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not allies, but opponents? Elizabeth tried to split the difference between her siblings, at least in her own chapel. However, her Puritan bishops did further damage to church fabric.

Elizabeth was heralded by reform-minded Englishmen as an Old Testament figure like Deborah who was to complete the purification of the church, “which in her case entailed repurging England of its monks and its Mass, as well as destroying, or redestroying, its idols.” Her attempts at this were half-hearted at best and hypocritical at worst, considering that she kept much of the façade of the Latin Mass (now in English) in her own personal chapel, including richly decorated vestments and the crucifix at the center of the altar as in the style of the English Church when in union with Rome. This hold over was an unwelcome compromise to the Puritans and more committed Calvinists with idolaters. Elizabeth’s difficulties in constructing her religious settlement came from the diverse opinions of her subjects but also because of the diverse precedents built up in the previous twenty years of the last three Tudors. Though Elizabeth allowed and reaffirmed through the canons of the church, the laws passed by Parliament and injunctions by her father and her brother for the removal of images, Elizabeth amended these injunctions to be more accommodating for images not connected with superstition. This was a complete disappointment to most of her bishops and many of the reform-minded writers and clergy.
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53 Margaret Aston, 298-300.
The royal proclamation issued by Elizabeth I on 19 September 1560, to suppress iconoclasm was somewhat important for the preservation of some images, however there is little evidence for the creation of religious or absolutist art sponsored by Elizabeth. She did temper iconoclasm with moderation. This was expressed in her revision of Edward’s injunctions to be less strident, more subtle.

The Queen’s Majesty, understanding that by the means of sundry people, partly ignorant, partly malicious, or covetous, there hath been of late years spoiled and broken certain ancient monuments, some of metal, some of stone, which were erected up as well in churches as in other public places within this realm only to show a memory to the posterity of the person there buried, or that had been benefactors to the building or donations of the same churches or public places, and not to nourish any kind of superstition;

By which means not only the churches and places remain at this present day spoiled broken, and ruinated, to the offense of all noble and gentle hearts and the extinguishing of the honorable and good memory of sundry virtuous and noble persons deceased; but also the true understanding of diverse families in the realm (who have descended of blood of the same persons deceased) is thereby so darkened as the true course of their inheritance may be hereafter interrupted contrary to justice, besides many other offenses that hereof do ensure to the slander of such as either gave or had charge in times past only to deface monuments of idolatry and false feigned images in churches and abbeys; and therefore, although it be very hard to recover things broken and spoiled, yet both to provide that no such barbarous disorder be hereafter used, and to repair as much of the said monuments as conveniently may be:

Her majesty chargeth and commandeth all manner of persons hereafter to forbear the breaking or defacing of any parcel of any monument, or tomb, or grave, or other inscription and memory of any person deceased being in any manner of place, or to break any image of Kings, princes, or noble estates of this realm, or of any other that have been in times past erected and set up for the only memory of them to their posterity in common churches and not for any religious honor, or to break down or deface any image in glass windows in any church without consent of the ordinary.

Upon pain that whosoever shall herein be found to offend to be committed in the next jail, and there to remain without bail or mainprize unto the next coming of the justices for the delivery of the said jail, and then to be further punished by fine or imprisonment (besides the restitution or reedification of the thing broken) as to the said justices hall seem meet, using therein the advice of the ordinary and (if need shall be) the advice also of her majesty’s council in her Star Chamber.\(^{54}\)

The key points of this injunction were that iconoclasm had gone too far, the iconoclasts are variously motivated for gain, often taking valuables, or overzealous or just plain ignorant. They had broken a range of commemorating objects and liturgical objects that were not idolatrous. Tomb-breaking damages the honorable memory of the dead and destroys valuable data, and the original terms of the ordinance against idolatry have been exceeded. No more tombs or secular images are to be broken and that only certain types of painted glass can be broken if it were deemed idolatrous. All losses are to be recourse and any legal damage repaired, and that the terms of the proclamation are to be supported by threat of excommunication. The local church authority, the bishop, should work in tandem with the state’s highest authority before there is any more destruction of imagery. Ironically, the bishops were often instrumental in iconoclasm.

Indeed the royal chapel of Elizabeth held out firm against the image-breakers, while a running fight went on. Repeatedly, the personal crucifix of Elizabeth was damaged or stolen by image-breakers in the royal chapel. The injunctions ordered in 1660 to preserve, not destroy images, especially funeral monuments as well as statues and paintings may have been a response to the iconoclasm personally experienced by Elizabeth herself. Her own ancestor’s tombs had been ravaged along with her cross. Yet, the official stance about image was confusing.

Aston’s study of various outbreaks of iconoclasm explained the importance of the subtlety in Elizabeth’s injunctions and the difficulty in trying to satisfy an ever religiously diverse nation. For example, Elizabeth’s second injunction reworded the 1547 order to the clergy against preaching in favor of images from the Edwardian form of “they shall not set forth or extol any images, relics, or miracles, for any superstition or lucre, nor lure the people by any enticements to the pilgrimage of any saint or image; but reproving the same . . . to they shall not set forth or

extol the dignity of any images, relics, or miracles; but declaring the abuse of the same.  

Elizabeth slightly moderated the Edwardian antipathy to image. Elizabeth reworded other injunctions by Edward that attacked images to leave out the injunction against images all together. Elizabeth did not intend to put the clock back to 1548. But she did little to defend or promote images for the church or for the state except portraits that flattered her. Elizabeth left no unified or clear precedent in England on the use of or the destruction of images.

The confused and convoluted use of images in Elizabeth’s “middle of the road” construction allowed for places in England to keep their precious religious artworks. But in other locals, crowds rampaged through the streets with royal injunction in hand, and destroyed all images they came across, not just those connected to abuse spoken of in softened Elizabethan injunctions. Oddly, it was the bishops she elevated, even as she disposed of the Marian bishops, who were significantly responsible for iconoclasm in the Elizabethan period. The preaching of Puritan Elizabethan Bishops, which encouraged isolated destruction of images, and these eruptions occurred more than once during her long reign in various areas of the country. Aston noted that the bishops’ interpretation, in their “inspections” for erroneous images, led to the removal of all imagery in churches.
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56 Margaret Aston, 299.
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59 Margaret Aston, 320-330. Aston argued that Elizabeth was often at odds with the extreme iconoclasm of her own clergy. So why did she appointed them in the first place. Others with a more moderate tone could have been found in England. It seems that she feared a radical Protestant backlash rather than a traditionalist or Catholic backlash according to her appointments of Puritan bishops.
One point is clear when one examines the Tudor reign: all but one of the Tudors had a religious tradition that allowed for some kind of religious imagery to survive. “Henry VIII and Elizabeth I had more in common with Mary than is sometimes allowed for: given the choice they preferred some of the comforts of ancient ritual to the brilliant nakedness of the new Word.”

However, the later Tudors were pressured by the religious forces to purify England of all of its remaining idolatry and popery. “With the notable exception of Edward VI, whose title of young Josiah seems well earned, the Tudor monarchs appeared to have been united in holding out against the iconoclasts, trying to restrain the destroyers and safeguarded the existence of at least some imagery.”

Elizabeth could be judged “prudent” in her lack of restraint against iconoclasm, as it was often popularly motivated. However, her actions could be viewed as cowardly in that she did not uphold her own personal beliefs about imagery as exemplified in her private chapel.

Though Elizabeth insisted on her crucifix and candles at her high altar, no evidence supports her commissioning any religious paintings for churches or cathedrals. But she did have a tapestry of a crucifixion behind her altar as a replacement for her damaged crucifix. Her use of art hardly extended to the personal or to historical propaganda of her dynasty, as did her father’s, with the exception of portraiture. Issues about imagery remained unsettled during and immediately after her reign. How does one balance traditional religious observance with the
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62 Margaret Aston, 313. In 1567, after another breaking of her crucifix by an offending youth, she replaced the cross for a while with a tapestry of the Crucifixion that hung directly behind the communion table. After the youth broke the candlesticks around Christmas of that year, he was taken to the Tower of London at the Queen’s order.
rejection of the tradition by a small but ever growing party within the church, especially when
this minority often casted off authority and tradition as non-essential? How does England insert
herself into the emerging culture of the day with such conflicting views on the arts at home?
Elizabeth did not grapple with this issue, but James did. The answer for James was a moderate
change, an enhancement of imagery in church and state. The response by Charles was to turn
toward the more traditional elements of his Church and embrace image making, even religiously
themed works such as the Banqueting House Cycle. For Charles, art was to be used for the
service of an absolutist theory of church and state.

Difference in Tastes and Use of Art: Tudor verses Stuart

It is difficult to describe in simple categories the religious persuasions of early modern
England. It is even more difficult to place in certain and strict categories the particular kinds of
monuments and artworks produced for these various religious groups. By-and-large one can see
first the High Church, anti-Calvinist faction, with a broad adhesion to the terms of the
Elizabethan Settlement and their defense of hierarchical relationship between the bishops and the
monarchy. They embraced much of the Catholic past as far as art and ceremony and had an
affinity to church traditions. They were the most conservative element in the English Church.
English Catholics, still in significant numbers in 1600, were able to produce consistent
traditional artworks but in vastly less numbers because of religious pressures and the fear of
iconoclasm and further persecutions. Puritans and Calvinists were inconsistent in their own use
of artworks for tombs or for portrait purposes. The religious spectrum of England, as opposed to
Catholic Europe, exhibited a particularly destabilized backdrop for the use of art as a propaganda
tool.

Though Elizabeth or the English Church leadership sparingly used religious art during her
reign, the use of religious art began to be revived from the beginning of James’s. This was lead
by the “high-church” party. This turn toward a visual culture was not well received by Puritans and Calvinists who gave priority to “godly preaching always seeking a society based on moral order and personal piety. Puritans often regarded the High Church party as tainted by the theology of Arminius and Catholicism and the High Church party could not distinguish Anabaptist and antinomians from Puritans.” 63 An example of this mistrust of imagery is the Puritan bishop of Gloucester, Miles Smith, who expressed his outrage at Dean William Laud’s reorganization of the cathedral furnishings in 1616. Bishop Smith, after seeing the reintroduction of previously disavowed art, vowed never to enter the building again until the popish decorations were expunged.64 He was incensed about the return of the altar to the traditional position, replacement of a few images of biblical saints and the use of candles sticks at the altar with a simple cross. For Smith, an avowed Puritan, these were retrogressions back to popery. For Laud, these were well within his understanding of the injunctions of Elizabeth and the Canon law of the English Church. As future archbishop of Canterbury, Laud would enforce the injunctions and code in this direction and beyond.

Unlike the Catholics who embraced art, Protestants who followed Calvin’s basic theories on art and Puritans argued that true religious expression was essentially verbal, not visual. The “visual” faith and the “verbal” faith found reconciliation difficult. This was seen in the futile attempt to bring together Catholicism and the Reformed tradition in France at the Colloquy of St. Germain-en-Laye in 1562. The debate was restricted to the use of images. Two groups of theologians from both churches hoped to meet somewhere in the middle. Calvin’s point


expressed that images are not simply against God’s commandment—they are also superfluous to, and actually detract from, where God reveals himself to us—in the Word. 65 This stood in contrast to the common Catholic and Lutheran opinions that images are the Bible of the illiterate, or that one can now show God as he revealed himself as a human, like us in all things but sin. The notions of Catholic art theorists who followed the Council of Trent, such as Bellarmine and Paleotti, argued art could be a spiritual ladder to greater communion with the divine than preaching was anathema to reformed Christians. Puritans and other Calvinists who followed John Calvin rejected these notions and remained unconvinced. Their view as one of the most literate groups in the early modern period was that the literate had no need of images. The Word could stand on its own.

 **Painting in Protestant England**

The portrait was the most important expression of art in England during the reign of Elizabeth, though other forms of painting such as Greek and Roman mythology were painted for the nobility of the day. 66 Henry VII and Henry VIII both commissioned murals and frescoes at Whitehall (destroyed in the fire) as other Catholics of their period portraying their military exploits that emphasized the “divine plan” in their victories. However, no great muralist or portrait painter worked for the court of Elizabeth. Most of the portraiture for the queen was done as gifts for Elizabeth by courtiers who were trying to flatter Gloriana. A prime example of this
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65 David Willis-Watkins, *The Second Commandment and Church Reform: The Colloquy of St. Germain-en Laye, 1562* (Princeton: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1994). This text describes the major issues between the Reformed Tradition, Catholicism, and Lutheranism on the use of images. Willis-Watkins argued that it is the reliance/over reliance of the reformed churches’ use of the Old Testament—as the basis for their rejection of imagery—that was used traditionally from the earliest times of the Christian church.

type of painting is *Elizabeth and the Three Goddesses* of 1659 (A-32), which shows Elizabeth
awarding herself the prize for her virtue. Here the goddesses symbolize virginity (Venus),
marriage (Hera queen of the gods and patron of motherhood), something always on the mind of
her court officials, and Pallas who represents armed might. Elizabeth represents Paris, and at the
same time, awards herself, as the goddesses flee her virtuous magnificence.

Another interesting and illustrative work is *An Allegory of the Tudor Succession* (A-33)
painted by Hans Epworth. This work features a seated Henry VIII flanked on the one side by
Mary and Philip of Spain with a figure of Mars, and on the other by Elizabeth and Edward VI
who are flanked by Peace and Plenty. A painting is devoid of religious symbolism and scarcely
evokes notions of Greek or Roman virtue. One important aspect of this work is the positioning
of the figures in the work. Interestingly, the right side (facing the direction of those portrayed),
which is traditionally reserved in painting and artworks for the elect or the redeemed, shows
Philip and Mary. Elizabeth and Edward are on the left or traditionally the damned or enemies
side. In all the Judgments painted in the Renaissance and Middle Ages this formula of those on
the right being the redeemed and those on the left being the damned is reversed in this portrait.
Even with this anomaly, it is most commonly asserted that this work is a prime example of
Protestant propaganda about the favorable succession of Protestant monarchs and their peaceful
and prosperous rule. In reality, Elizabeth’s reign was connected with ongoing wars and
economic decline. Elizabeth rule was romanticized during James I’s reign.

No evidence shows that Elizabeth commissioned any paintings that were religious in
nature. “Surviving paintings [by English artists] on religious subjects of the period are extremely
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Two notable exceptions during the early part of Elizabeth’s reign are *An Allegory of Man* (A-34) and *Allegory of the Wise and Foolish Virgins* (A-36). Both works may have been intended for a Protestant patron. Karen Hearn’s analysis of the artwork noted no intermediary in the *Allegory of Man*, therefore making it Protestant, but she neglected to notice that an angel hovering over the man in the center of the painting that clearly comes between him and the traditionally rendered resurrected Christ. The angel seems to be assisting the man caught in the pull of earthly pleasures, a rather intercessorial posture. This work does not seem to be so conclusively Protestant in nature, and *The Allegory* is just as inconclusive. They may have been made for Catholics.

No evidence indicates that Elizabeth collected any religious art. From what scholars have been able to discover, religious paintings were not central in the collections she inherited. They were central to the collections of contemporary princes in Italy, France, and Spanish dominions. Some of the English peers also continued to conserve and collect religious works by great and minor artists during the Elizabethan period.69 Most nobles in following her lead in the arts began to collect and commission portraiture or classically themed art, and they stayed away from most works that directly inferred religion. Works like the above-mentioned religious allegories ceased to be commissioned on any kind of regular basis during her reign (1558-1603).

Though interest in painting still existed in Elizabeth’s early modern England, options were severely limited by the ideology of the English Reform. For the Protestant aristocracy, who were more traditional, the options and comforts of art and artists in general were hampered by the
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iconoclasm and anti-art attitude of the Lords Spiritual, the senior churchmen. Many of the peers were still secretly Catholic. A conservative estimate shows that as many as twenty percent were still committed to the Old Church.\textsuperscript{70} For the aristocracy, one such comfort was to place tapestries, generally imported, and others hangings upon formerly bare or painted walls of many rooms: and, in consequence, to reduce the demand for domestic murals. These also had the advantage of being taken down or hidden if a particularly Puritan visitor came a calling. At the same time there was practically no demand for church murals as “the doctrines of the Reformers enforced a ‘decent plainness’ upon religious buildings,”\textsuperscript{71} which was enforced zealously by most bishops during the reign of Elizabeth.

Portrait painting, which had often included religious themes and symbolic statements about the belief of the subject of the portrait, saw those themes excised from much of the artwork of the Elizabethan period. In this situation, the most reasonable opportunity for the painter to express ideals in portraiture were the concepts embraced by Humanism.

The stress on the individual that was the most revolutionary concept of the period entailed, for all its liberating influence, some severe restrictions. It considered an interest in mankind to be an interest in persons, history to be a pageant of theirs and remained a matter of direct communication between a man and his Maker.\textsuperscript{72}

English painting in this Protestant era tended toward the cult of the individual, and the artwork that read as religious emphasized the individual rather than the divine.

\textsuperscript{70} This is the low-end estimate of Christopher Haigh whose research shows the reluctance and slow advance of Protestantism in the Elizabethan age. This is pointed out in his essay “The Church of England, the Catholics and the People” found in The Reign of Elizabeth I (Athens Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1985). The underestimation of the residual resistance of Catholicism in Early Modern England is the major subject of his many works.

\textsuperscript{71} Eric Mercer, 149-150.

\textsuperscript{72} Eric Mercer, 149-150.
Art historians, such as Eric Mercer, also saw the beginnings of a proto-absolutist trend expressed in the Elizabethan period through this type of portrait painting. Thus, for Mercer, individualism was a force that helped change the iconography and helped to usher the disappearance of Catholic or Christian expression.

The more private nature of religion and the consequent attitude toward ‘idolatry’ eliminated any great desire for paintings of biblical subject or of individual saints and Madonna’s. With the painter in too humble a position to express whatever objection they may have had and with the narrative tradition of mural painting exerting no influence, the easel painting of the period was, in essence, a reflection of the ideas of the absolute state and its creatures and creator [the monarchy].

Painting and then sculpture emphasized the historical nature of the king or queen and the state, unlike the historical narratives being created in the Hapsburg dominions and in Italy. English portraiture was closer to a form of ancestor worship-veneration with no overt religious expression, unlike European counterparts. This “ancestor veneration” was expressed in tomb sculpture of the period.

Mercer examined the art collections of significant noblemen such as Leicester and Lumley’s collections that emphasized the important men of history as ancestors. This kind of collection showed some of the prevailing ideas on the importance of the individual and the nature of the state developing in Elizabethan England. Mercer’s research concluded that “inventories were quite catholic [universal] in their range and mingled, with an apparent lack of discrimination, friends and foes, co-religionist and heretic, Englishmen and foreigners.” What most of these collections emphasized was the notion of the great ancestor in whom the greatness
of a house or dynasty was justified. Even “dynasties” of religious or educational thought were commissioned. During the Jacobean period between 1616 and 1618 a series of over two hundred portraits chronicling the greatest individuals of secular and religious learning were commissioned at the Bodleian Library in Oxford. These portraits include very little religious imagery. Almost nothing in these paintings would have identified them as great seekers of religious truth or revelers of the mysteries of God.

The English Tomb: Protestant Taste in Funeral Art from 1560 to 1619

One of the most important places to explore the Puritan-Protestant-Calvinist aesthetic during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is tomb art. It is clear that funeral monuments were the most important type of art made in England after the Reformation. During the Elizabethan age, it is surprising to note that most of the art created for and displayed in churches exhibited almost a total lack of Christian imagery. Ironically, the tomb was a creation that made the final statement about the believer regarding his faith. What is just as surprising was the amount of pagan classical Greek and Roman imagery used to show the virtue of the Protestant inhabitant of the tomb.

Connoisseurs of painting and sculpture in the England of the post-Reformation recognized a “dangerous side” to the images from the Calvin’s viewpoint. He taught that legitimate images were ones in accord with the world of nature rather than with the world of imagination or belief. The problem of monumental images was that they were comprehended

75 Eric Mercer, 156-159.
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77 Jean Calvin, The institution of Christian religion, vveryten in Latine by maister Ihon Caluin, and translated into Englysh according to the authors last edition. Seen and allowed
though the sense of sight, and they regarded sight as untrustworthy or even diabolical as it
distracted one from the spiritual world. The sense of sight was most active in sculpture as a truly
three-dimensional art form. Calvin’s “teaching [about the sense of sight] shows that even
theological opinion was subsumed within the general assumption that the illusions perceived by
the senses were subject to scales of importance, hierarchies of value and varying degrees of
scepticism.”78 The world of sight was a pitfall for the true follower of Calvin’s radical rejection
of religiously themed art.

Some of the “fear” of image was grounded in the generalized patriarchal fear of woman as
an irresistible allure. The principle of “uncontrolled allure” also informed the discussions of
idolatry by some of the writers of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century in England.
Bishop Reginald Peacock warned those who were devoted to these images were like those who
were devoted to sexual relations. He claimed that images were powerful forces of the visual
imagination and such imagery should not have a place in the Church of England.79 Peacock
warned the young “Grand Tourists” streaming to Italy not to enjoy the visual stimuli to excess.
Here he echoes a consistent theme in some reformist moralizing literature that the sense of sight
makes one vulnerable to the works of the devil. Ironically, “church art” and especially
Elizabethan and early Jacobean funeral art was devoid of religious imagery that might “lure” one
into idolatry.

---


79 Nigel Llewellyn, 243.
Fashions also helped keep religious symbolism and iconography out of funereal art after the reform. One of Eric Mercer’s main themes in his study of English tomb art was that “fashions,” inseparable from the history of the English Reformation in funeral monuments, also determined and very severely restricted both the style of the sculptors and the subject-matter.80

It became the “fashion” for the growing merchant classes, often Puritan, to follow the lead of the landed gentry in funeral monuments. A growing number wealthy merchant class Protestants and minor aristocracy employed sculptors to memorialize their lives and often their professions. Though these “classes” tended to have simpler tombs and sculptural works commissioned, they did follow the tastes of the higher nobility in adornment of small or massive architectural tombs. Depending on their wealth, they utilized very little religious iconography or decoration.81

The religious and social changes of the mid sixteenth-century had an effect on native sculpture that had a twofold result:

They [reforming monarchs] destroyed the wealth and influence of the medieval Catholic Church in England then, therefore, the widest market and keenest inspiration for the sculptor in early modern England. The second effect was that the market for sculptors then became the new classes of wealthy but individually powerless landed proprietors with a Protestant ideology, therefore religious feeling of these new patrons could not be expressed in the familiar ways by erecting or adorning churches with religious iconography of the old religion.82

Once the church was, for all practical purposes, “out of the business” of commissioning art, sculpture had to change radically from the past expressions and be different from the sculptural forms being renewed and created on the continent. In England, “the religious feeling of these new men could not be expressed in the old way, in erecting or adorning churches; within a

80 Eric Mercer, 217.
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82 Eric Mercer, 217.
church it could reveal itself upon little but their tombs, and since, while not equating wealth with 
worth, they tended to regard the former as an outward sign of the latter, they made these 
[monuments] display their rank and station.”¹⁸³ Large, sumptuous, and expensive shrines became 
the sign of election, not Christian iconography.

This as an early expression of the “gospel of prosperity” was often associated with 
Puritanism. These tombs therefore had “to be impressive [and] they needed to be large, for the 
trade-nature of tomb-making at the time, carried out by men all at much the same level of skill 
and with the same lack of inspiration, allowed wealth to reveal itself only in the size of the 
monument and richness of its ornament and material”¹⁸⁴ not its religious sensibility or a 
renaissance expression of form or beauty. Mercer argued that for this new class of patrons, 
wealth was a sign of election, not the old familiar signs of angels, crosses, or the Virgin and 
Child.

In comparison to most works done during the Catholic period of the sixteenth-century, the 
individualism of these Protestant monuments is striking. The former Catholic monuments--the 
chantry monuments--were designed as buildings within a building, wherein priests could offer 
masses for the soul of the individual buried within the monument. The monument was not so 
much for the display of his rank, his connections, or his family. It was more of a hope for a 
happy outcome in the afterlife through the prayers of the church and good works offered by the 
individual, his family and friends. But some were indeed splendid.

The “secular” nature of these Protestant tombs was involved with a notion of the descent 
of blood, as well as the prosperity of the ancestor. Mercer’s research revealed, “The great and

¹⁸³ Eric Mercer, 218.

lesser medieval families had been able to take their ‘line’ for granted; these later men could not and so they emphasized it wherever they could.”

These Elizabethan tombs were monuments not to God or even strictly about the faith of the tombs’ inhabitants. Tombs during the Elizabethan period and the early Jacobean period were more often about the family or heraldry.

The importance and protection of such tombs now had become indispensable for the state. They became markers of rank and status within English society. Injunctions were made against iconoclasm in 1560 forbidding the destruction and ruin of monuments and tombs mainly because of their historical value and for the protection of personal family history. These injunctions were not put into place to spare these monuments for their religious or artistic values. What was more important for Elizabeth and the state she was creating was as John Weever noted fifty years later: “The honorable and good memory of sundry virtuous and noble persons deceased . . . and the preservation of the images of . . . Kings, Princes, or noble estates of this Realm, or of any other that have been in times past set up, for the only memory of them to they’re posterities in common Churches, and not for any religious honor.”

Tombs were created and preserved from attacks by iconoclasts because they were records of virtuous and noble ancestors of present rulers and in the end a memory of the social fabric of the aristocracy. Elizabeth felt strongly enough about the substance of family lineage that her only major renovation of tombs were for her Yorkist ancestors in Fotheringay church, where she replaced those desecrated by iconoclasts.

---
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The characteristics of many tombs in this period showed their reference to classical, not Christian culture. These tombs, according to Llewellyn, showed a “nagging ambiguity about the pagan thread in Elizabethan classicism….To what extent was the pagan acceptable in Elizabethan church art?”

Though the saints were driven out, pagan virtues were accepted. Lawrence Humphrey in The Nobles: or, Of Nobilitye, a book dedicated to Elizabeth I and published in 1563, dealt with the importance of a rich visual culture to accompany death rituals. Humphrey sought to justify the noble’s privileges and thought that even modest monuments could be enough to honor the peers.

In his treatise, Humphrey also connected early modern monuments to ancient monuments of his perfect state, ancient Rome. He connected these monuments of antiquity with rank, honor and coats of arms, and suggested that funeral monuments of his day were used in the same way and for the same reason as they had been in ancient Rome. Following the lead of Humphrey and others who wrote and argued for such a taste in tomb art, the Elizabethan age saw a radical shift from late Medieval and early Renaissance Christian tomb sculpture to a type of tomb that celebrated family lineage, personal piety, and a distinct lack of Christian imagery.

These tombs emphasized the personal faith of the individual, but even more clearly emphasized the line of decent from the ancestor. This representative configuration of the “faithful ancestor” tomb is exampled in the Monument of Sir Anthony Cooke (d.1576) (A-36) and

---
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the Monument of Thomas Andrewes (d. 1590) (A-37). Both tombs show families in a rather hieratic formation, stiff, staid, emotionless, and focused toward the deceased whom they remember. A common thread of these sculptures is the lack of talent that most show. The “plainness” of Protestantism lowered the mark from what English sculptors had been able to achieve during the earlier part of the century. Native artistic skill and talent were to revive only after the advent of the Stuarts.

Most of these types of tombs showed no outward sign of the “election,” salvation of the individual, or the presence of the supernatural. In addition, a complete lack of emotion is evident; grief is absent from those who mourn at the tomb as is their lack of elation at the salvation of the inhabitant. Eyes are usually focused upward in an attitude of personal reflection and piety reflecting on the un-seeable Divine. In the seventeenth-century, these types of funeral monuments gradually were replaced by new models with roots in Baroque sensibilities not expressed in the aesthetic of Puritanism-Calvinism of the Elizabethan period. They became akin to the Catholic Counter-Reformation’s love of sentiment, nature, and image.

English artistic sensibilities became more in tune with the greater European culture only in the second decade of the reign of James I and flourished during Charles I’s kingship. According to Eric Mercer, these ideas and sensibilities were threefold: “A deepening freedom of emotion between individuals and within a family, a reaction of many among the upper class against the austere Puritanism of the earlier generations and the consequent adoption of a more emotional attitude toward religion and the consciously held aesthetic views of the virtuosi.”92 The clarity, emotion, and realism of the Council of Trent finally made headway into the English aesthetic and mindset in the early Stuart period.

92 Eric Mercer, 241.
This changing aesthetic was greatly influenced by those who traveled in the last decade of the sixteenth-century and the first two decades of the seventeenth-century to see the wonders created in the Catholic south. Many of the great masterworks of the Renaissance and the newly produced masterworks of the Baroque were made present in England through the aggressive collecting of Queen Anne of Denmark, Henry, Prince of Wales, and then Charles. Other collectors reflected this new openness to the gathering of religious art as well as the commission of religious art. One fact is certain: This new openness was made possible because of the general peace that James I secured and his ecumenical policies for marriage for his children. James and Charles were much more Europeanist than Elizabeth ever had been.

Examples of the change ushered in during the Stuart age include sentiment and the renewal of religious imagery. Tombs such as the Monument of Sir John Jeffery (d. 1611) at Whitchurch Canonicorum, Dorset (A-38) exemplified this movement. It is an altar-shaped tomb with putti figures above the columns and two full-figured angels in the corners of the arch. Also of note is the cross held by one of the allegory figures above the column to the right. The cross had been assaulted through numerous iconoclastic attacks in graveyards and churchyards during the reign of Elizabeth, as well as its symbolic use during the rite of baptism. This change was abrupt and was signaled by the arrival of a king from Scotland whose mother was a Catholic martyr.

Another example of the reintroduction of religious symbolism in the early reign of James I is that of the Tomb of Lord Teynham (A-39). Though the Teynhams were Catholic, they set the tone for the unrestrained emotion that would be unleashed after the 1630s on contemporary
Protestant tombs. The daughters of Teynham are almost inconsolable at the loss of their father. Above them in the upper register is a multitude of putti. Images of angels, the Cardinal virtues, or the Theological Virtues, which were common in sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries Catholic monuments in Europe, now, were expressed openly in tomb art in England. Early on in James’s rule, these “religious” virtues were often personifications of the virtues disguised in a religiously neutral or antique pagan inspiration.

Hubert Le Sueur introduces the movement toward the aesthetic of the continent in the Tomb of Ludovic Stuart (A-40). Here Lodovic’s tomb is surmounted by an angel of fame. It also has two cherubs under the effigy of Ludovic. Classically clad, the four cardinal virtues hold up the magnificent canopy. Another example of religious imagery of the Old Testament is the Monument to Mary Digges (A-41). This work exhibits the four cardinal virtues seated on pedestals around an ionic column. In 1631, Dudley Digges used a text from the book of Genesis to “praise his wife Mary Moyle: ‘and Rachel travailed and had hard labor. And it came to pass…that the midwife said unto her, Fear not: thou shalt have this son also…And Rachel died, and was buried….And Jacob set a pillar upon her grave’ (35:16-20) the monument has no effigy but comprises a 10-foot pillar upon his own [Dudley Digges] sepulcher.” Numerous tombs were created such as this tomb with a noted return in religious iconography. This change

---
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appeared abruptly in the middle of the second decade (and continued in the third decade) of the
seventeenth-century.\textsuperscript{96}

One of the most important tombs of noblemen was the \textit{Tomb of Robert Cecil}, First Earl of
Salisbury (A-42), and the work of Maximilian Colt. Here Colt’s inspiration has been thought to
be influenced by French or Dutch exemplars.\textsuperscript{97} The tomb design is one of nearly life-sized
kneeling virtues holding an effigy of the earl with a skeleton below. This same basic structure
was to be employed often in the seventeenth-century for other noblemen.\textsuperscript{98} Tomb monuments
with not-so-veiled religious themes appeared as if from nowhere during the reign of James.
Catholic themes like the \textit{memento mori}, which had roots in the late Middle Ages and the Italian
Renaissance, were consistently in use in religious art and sculpture on the continent. Important
nobles such as Cecil reintroduced them to England.

The cadaver figured large on the tomb created by Maximilian Colt for Robert Cecil in
1612 or 1613 at Hatfield (A-42).\textsuperscript{99} \textit{The Dean of Fotherby’s} tomb, set up in 1619 at Canterbury
Cathedral shows the whole skeleton carved in “hideous” detail,\textsuperscript{100} emphasize the currents of
connection to Europe. These artistic elements experienced a renewed use in Italy and Spain
concurrently and prominently figured on papal tombs during the sixteenth and seventeenth-
century. They were easily accessible to Protestants during the time of general peace or such
times as Holy Years. The pull of emotion, specifically grief, so important in Baroque art, helped

\textsuperscript{96} Brian Kemp, 70.
\textsuperscript{97} Brian Kemp, 77.
\textsuperscript{98} Brian Kemp, 77.
\textsuperscript{99} Eric Mercer, \textit{English Art 1553-1625}, 245.
\textsuperscript{100} Eric Mercer, 245.
to make these monuments signs of hope for resurrection rather than statements of heraldry as they commonly were during the Elizabethan period.

Depictions of death and of hope for resurrection—so familiar in Catholic art in the sixteenth-century—reappeared rapidly in the reign of James, as exemplified in the Monument of Thester Salisbury who died in 1614. This tomb was decorated with the emblems of the five wounds of Christ’s Passion and with the Crown of Thorns. Clearly, this theme connects Thester with the suffering of Christ and the hope of the resurrection. These and other such works are evidence of the relaxation of the Calvinist traditional “ban” of religious themes used in the monuments created during the reign of James. But what was their ultimate source in England?

These changing images did not go unnoticed. Certain of the “Godly” began to complain after 1612 about a smell of popery to these monuments. Mrs. Esdaile, a Puritan and a minor member of the court, noted that full-length angels reappeared on tombs of the early seventeenth-century and that it was odd that they suggested “no thought of Popery.” Mrs. Esdaile was quite right to notice this shift. In fact, there had been a not so subtle move toward an intellectual sympathy and a relaxing of persecution of Catholics during this period of negotiations for a Spanish Match for Prince Henry and then Prince Charles. This movement toward a more traditional remembrance at the grave came from an intellectual sympathy and the reality of political opportunism. The “relaxing of the former persecution of Catholics and allowing the

101 Eric Mercer, 245.
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expression at least in part of Catholic and near-Catholic views and feelings” made great political sense to James in the second decade of the sixteenth-century. This regressive shift, in the eyes of the Puritans, seems plausible because of the dynasties’ political ambitions. It was given form, however, in a magnificent tomb, the first royal tomb built since Henry VII’s tomb. This tomb was also rich in religious iconography, the tomb of Catholic Mary Stuart (Figures 1-1, 1-2, 1-3). It is no coincidence that James commissioned a sympathetic history of Mary Stuarts reign at this time.

Expressions of the spiritual or the presence of the divine, such as cherubs, had been familiar in early Renaissance work from the time of Henry VII. But these expressions were seldom incorporated into tomb work (except by Catholics) in sixteenth-century England after the Reformation, and they particularly suffered in the Elizabethan period. After their reintroduction, they became a standard ingredient of monumental iconography in English tomb art until the end of the eighteenth century. Cherubs were usually shown as complete figures, but sometimes they were portrayed only as winged heads. It is interesting to note that both of these types of angels are featured prominently on the Tomb of Mary Queen of Scots (Figure 1-2). It does not seem a stretch of the imagination to assume that the use of these symbols, which had suffered iconoclastic attack during the early Reformation in England, became templates after their well-known display on the tomb of the “Martyred” queen. Once again, the divine was expressed as moving and involved in the real world of man through the action and intercession of God’s most

104 Eric Mercer, 245.

105 Both of these realities will be featured in the following chapters dealing with the influence of the memory of Mary Queen of Scots.
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powerful supernatural agents. Angels were overt signs of God’s redemptive power and intermediaries of divine grace which had been played down by English Protestantism or eliminated from the artistic vocabulary altogether. On Mary’s tomb, the divine was imaged again, but criticisms arose by those who supported Word over Image.

Many dissenters protested tomb building. Some convinced Protestants were concerned about showing excess and pride in these images, even if they were not idolatrous. In their mind, these excess and false prides were part of the papist tradition and needed to be guarded against at all cost. Complaints arose about the construction of such magnificent tombs from the beginning of the reform. As early as the 1540s Bishop Knight chose to be commemorated not by a tomb but by a pulpit erected at Wells Cathedral (A-43) so that his memorial might be useful.

Because of the danger of pride, fear of idolatry, and the great cost for figures in tombs, some of the Protestant elite abandoned figures altogether. One such example is Edward Hoby. Hoby translated Coignet’s *Les Instruments aux Princes* that he re-titled *Politique discourses upon Truth and lying*. This translated work of 1585 described painters as renderers of deceit and lewdness, and linked all statuary with the notion of idolatry. Members of the Hoby family were known as great tomb patrons for most of the sixteenth-century. But after the death of his wife in 1605, Sir Edward decided to utilize a small obelisk with a heart surrounded by swans rather than to have human figures involved in the memorial at all. Even as a movement arose toward tombs that are more traditional by some of the elite, others resisted strongly and reiterated the tradition of the simpler Protestant aesthetic achieved during Elizabeth’s reign.

---


As magnificent tombs returned, a growing complaint arose that tombs only comforted the living, not the dead. The Elizabethan reformer Thomas Becon quoted St. Augustine in his famous rebuke from *The City of God* that an expensive and “sumptuous and costly burial rather comfort the living than help the dead.”

Richard Brathwaite, who died in 1585,

stressed the traditional message whereby riches stored in heaven have greater value than those made on earth. A fellow may give a costly funeral ‘or erect in your memory some gorgeous Monument, to shewe your vaine-glory in death, as well as life’ but you will soon be forgotten ‘ere…one worne enter the shroud, which coverd the corpes. Educated patrons may [and more than likely would] have known [many] humanist version[s] of this topos.”

For many convinced reformed believers, creation of such memorials, even simple ones, smelled of popery, and the cult of purgatory where the faithfully departed were remembered and even prayed for at their tombs.

The Puritan minister Thomas Gainsford, a contemporary of James I, was also a critic of the monumental tomb.

He told the poor [in sermons and writings] that their souls would be in heaven though their bodies would be in the churchyard and that ‘gorgeous buildings, sumptuous tombs, large hospitalles etc.’ were vanities, not signs of piety. Meanwhile, he preached, the rich men richly commemorated ‘shall be tormented in hell.’

---
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Though prosperity was a sign of election, conspicuous consumption was not. Ample evidence of
the preaching of the godly testifies that many in early modern England were not supporters of the
“vanities” of image or commemoration in elaborate tombs.

**Traditionalism: Catholic Survivals in Tomb Art**

The most “Catholic” of the survivals in tomb art in England was the altar tomb. A fine
example is the *Tomb of Sir John Jeffery* (A-38). The traditional Catholic altar was challenged in
use and purpose by Protestant theology and most were replaced with a simple communion table
that was more accessible to the faith community. However, it also devalued the importance of
Eucharist, as did the new Protestant theology. Often these tables were placed in the nave of the
church rather than in the traditional location of the sanctuary. During the reigns of Elizabeth and
James, the altar was not always placed even at the east end of the church, though this seemed to
be their personal preference in their own chapels. Archbishop Laud made this a controversial
element of his policy in the 1630s in demanding that all tables be placed altar-wise in churches.
He took the traditional pre-Reformation view that the most sacred space in the church was the
east end sanctuary where “the divine mysteries were to be celebrated.”

A number of tombs were built that echoed this more traditional sentiment. A small group
of Protestant tombs were constructed during the end of the reign of Elizabeth and during James’s
reign that took the form of an altar. These were placed in the sanctuary portion of the church.
The tomb of John Hoskyn in Abbey Dore, Herefordshire, and the *Scott Family Memorial* (A-44)
created in 1600 at Brabourne, Kent, are both good examples of this type of tomb. The Scott
family tomb even acted as the high altar for Anglican services, and includes lengthy genealogies
and texts from the Bible.\(^{112}\)

\(^{112}\) Nigel Llewellyn, 115.
The Christian altar was and is (in Eucharist-based churches) an image of the tomb that Christ was buried in and from which he was resurrected. It is a remembrance of his sacrifice and the communal link to the believer. “This symbolism was strengthened by the popularity of Easter sepulchers as sites for burial and commemoration.”\textsuperscript{113} At times, these altar tombs were used for the repose of the Easter Sacrament kept for the distribution to the sick and homebound until it was used up after the Easter celebrations ended. These tombs were usually in the north wall of the sanctuary. Here the reserved sacrament was traditionally kept by more traditional “high” church practitioners in the English Church (a leftover from Catholic practice).\textsuperscript{114} Calvinism denied the effectiveness of the sacraments in that they were essentially only symbols of grace already present through the faith of the believer. Emphasis on sacramentalism was an anti-Calvinistic practice and example in tomb art and the retention of former Catholic practice by a few in the Church of England.

Another conservative element to survive was the fact that some more traditional (in a pre-Reformation sense) Protestants began to aggressively question the Calvinistic Protestant disqualification of the use of sculpture in a religious context altogether. In 1618, Robert Reyce regretted that monuments remained “‘subject to envy, bitternesse of malice etc.’ The anatomists’ brother, William Burton, regarded iconoclastic attacks on his beloved Leicestershire as ‘the vain and idle conceits of some novelists.’”\textsuperscript{115} The biographer of Bishop Laud, John Evelyn, noted that when God ordered Moses to engrave the law upon the tablets, God had created sculpture
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even before he condemned idolatry.\textsuperscript{116} Committed Protestants could also defend sculpture with religious themes in the early seventeenth-century, but a considerable shift appeared in ideology after the coming of the Stuarts.

John Weever, the author of \textit{Ancient Funerall Monuments}, in the late 1620s and early 1630s leveled a vicious and wide-ranging attack on iconoclasm. This was within the context of a wider defense of religious orthodoxy: attacks on tombs [and artworks] were as impious as heretical sermons and as treasonable as the invasion of the realm. Monuments occupied extremely sensitive territory; they personified a blurring of distinctions between idols to be worshipped and images to be followed as examples and were an easy target for devotees of new religious creeds amongst the masses.\textsuperscript{117}

However, the fact that such a work was written by Weever well into the reign of the Stuarts gives witness to the consistent threat against art, in particular art that seemed to be religious in nature. This attack on art would be evidenced by renewed iconoclasm during the Civil War and the sale of most of the art collections of aristocrats who supported Charles along with the magnificent riches that Charles had amassed. Weever’s view is expressed clearly in this excerpt from his work:

\begin{quote}
Certain persons, delighting as may seems in novelitie, for they can abide not mark of antiquitie [who] had defaced [the antiquities], these man that take upon them to be reformers, whose duties are grate through the singularities and pride they have in their own wits and understandings, weening themselves to be very wise, where indeed they are very simple, and only look but into the abuses of things, and do not see into the grounds and depth of the reasons and causes for which good ordinances are made. . . never seek they to reforme the abuse,
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{117}Nigel Llewellyn, 270.
but by their wits, goeth ordinance and all… [Weever hoped] that these simple fellows taking upon them to be reformers might be reformed themselves.\textsuperscript{118}

Weever thought that iconoclasts were those who were encouraged by a broad spectrum of schismatics and those who spread seditious pamphlets. He noted that these men also were often anti-monarchy. Lists of sectarians were long and grew longer in early Stuart England. In the view of Weever, few images could be idols, which rendered “our blessed Savior hanging on the Cross.” These visual images were acceptable and respectable because they taught as well, as did the mental images of the book. Weever’s writings were dedicated to Archbishop Laud. Sharing Laud’s view, Weever stated that the belief in the importance of images was necessary for a proud and respectable church to be maintained and constructed.\textsuperscript{119} In his publications, Weever was an important supporter of Charles and Laud’s restoration, additions to St. Paul’s, and other artistic building projects before the Civil War. Obviously, Weever could have stumbled into his thought through reflection on the works of Aristotle, but the numerous works defending religious art produced after the Council of Trent likely was his influence. His arguments for the power of image are extremely similar to that of Paleotti who had been translated into English.

**James I and the Monuments in Westminster Abbey**

As noted early in this study, two of the most important tomb monuments done early in James’s reign are found in Westminster Abbey. The first is the grave site of Queen Elizabeth I (Mary I is buried rather uncomfortably next to her in an unmarked grave) (Figures 3-2, 3-3),

\textsuperscript{118} John Weever, *Ancient funerall monuments within the vnited monachrie of Great Britaine, Ireland, and the islands*. . . (London: Printed by Thomas Harper. 1631. And are to be sold by Laurence Sadler at the signe of the Golden Lion in little Britaine, 1631), 54.

\textsuperscript{119} John Weever, 50.
which is void of religious symbolism, magnificently rendered, yet not as splendidly as the second which is the grave site of Mary Queen of Scots (exhumed and moved there by her son James). These works are in opposing wings of the Lady Chapel created by Henry VII in Westminster Abbey, London. Between Elizabeth I and Mary is Henry VII’s tomb, created with significant religious imagery. The official tomb of Mary, who linked the two dynasties together, reintroduced religious symbolism on this dynastic monumental work. The Cross, four full-length angels, two putti heads, and the Chi Ro are prominently displayed on this tomb. Obviously, by containing such religious imagery, in a very public venue, the tomb’s creation made possible or even validated religious themes for others (Figures 1-1, 1-2, 1-3). Mary’s tomb instillation in 1612 is significant in that many more religious works of art began to be produced. Their production had dynastic approval. The decade long involvement with religious themes culminated in a grand cycle at St. Paul’s Cathedral of the life of Paul in stained glass in 1619.120

On Mary’s tomb, three angels are portrayed over the arches on either side of the magnificent portrait of the “martyred” queen. Other religious symbols associated with Catholicism are prominently exhibited, including the Cross at both ends of the gable, the crown of thorns, and the $XP$ (Figure 1-3). Though sumptuous and beautiful, this is not the typical tomb made to show Protestant wealth or stoic virtue, but martyrdom and personal faith. Mary lies in repose with an almost beatific look and serene countenance. Juxtaposed to the rather stiff and formal tomb of Elizabeth who clutches her signs of monarchy, Mary Stuart looks upward, hands folded as if in prayer, to heaven to receive her crown of martyrdom like a Counter-Reformation saint.

\[120\] This cycle is discussed in chapter 4. Its creation was such a significant event in London that James attended the dedication.
The religious symbolism was not lost on the viewer of the early seventh century of this murdered-martyred-executed queen. Her grandson Charles I will meditate on such a martyr’s crown in his last will and testament in *Eikon Basilike* (A-45). This inclusion of angels to watch over her is clearly a rather traditionalist statement of the notion of God’s presence in the world who would resurrect his holy anointed, with the help of his divine intermediaries. Martyrdom was considered the fastest way to glory, especially those who suffered as Christ did. Mary’s tomb in general is a positive religious statement about the queen and her ironic victory over Elizabeth. Thought she herself never clutched the orb and scepter. It is her dynasty that now holds power in England.

James’s choice of the Our Lady Chapel is also revealing. The Virgin Mary is the most powerful intercessor in Catholic theology, and is connected with martyrdom, as she suffered through the death of her son (hence, Mary often wears red as “mother of sorrows” and a living martyr). Most of the early Stuarts are buried in this chapel of Westminster, including Mary Stuart, James’s daughter who died in 1607 (Figure 3-4). James chose to be buried near Henry VII, close to the high altar of the Abbey, which is physically between the two rivals in life, Elizabeth and Mary. He asked that no monument be created for him. By being physically buried between England (Elizabeth) and Scotland (Mary), James made a rather important statement about his position as the unifier of Great Britain. Charles I always intended to create a tomb for his father, though lack of money prevented the creation of a splendid monument for the first Emperor of Great Britain. The Banqueting House paintings sufficed.

**Protestant English Print Media**

One exception to the exclusion of the use of image for the Puritan-Calvinist spectrum of England, like that of the main land, was the use of print media for polemics. The Puritans and other Protestants who rejected religious art included illustration in print. Print, being small,
unrealistic, and usually done in black and white, illustrated a story line and could be helpful in teaching. It was difficult to suggest that religious or semi-religious artwork could lead to idolatry in print (though several extreme critics of art did make that point). Print media was an essential component used by Lutherans, Calvinists, and Puritans (as well as Catholics) as an essential vehicle of the Reformation. Print was the natural ally of those who wished to explain the corruptions of the Catholic Church and extol the “defenders” of the new religion. A prime example of the type of print art that was acceptable to many, but not all Protestants and most Puritans was the work of John Foxe.

John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* was the most influential religious book of the sixteenth and early seventeenth-centuries in England. This work, originally a production of the Marian period (first edition, 1554), supplied a Protestant history of religion from the beginnings of the church to the present-day England of Foxe. It recorded the persecution of the “righteous” from the beginning of Genesis until burnings under Queen Mary Tudor, and placed that persecution of the “true” church in a millenarian scheme of history. This work persuaded Englishmen that they were fighting a holy war against the Antichrist who was connected with popish threats. It also concentrated on the sin of idolatry that was, in Foxe’s estimation, rampant in anything associated to Roman Catholicism. *Acts and Monuments* was enlarged and reprinted many times and was the basis for much of the Protestant rhetoric of early modern England. In later editions of this work, Elizabeth, who certainly tolerated the work as it enhanced her position in English myth, was heralded and portrayed as a second Constantine or Solomon, as in the woodcut from Thomas Morton’s *Salomon or a Treatise Declaring the State of the Kingdome of Israel*, printed in 1596. This work shows Elizabeth as an heir to the traditions of Solomon (A-46). Her brother Edward was often portrayed in *Acts and Monuments* and other similar texts as one of the reforming kings.
of the Old Testament, usually Josiah. Josiah was a destroyer of idols, as was Edward VI. In these printed works, the religious imagery of early Christian saints, such as Constantine, and biblical figures were not only tolerated but also embraced. But they were slightly reinterpreted to emphasize a break with Rome and Rome’s allegiance with the dark forces of the universe.

Almost from the beginning of James’s reign, some within the hierarchy and theological circles in the Church of England began to draw back from the apocalyptic descriptions of Foxe. However, by the 1630s a renewal of fear arose that the Church of England could slip back into the papal fold by many committed Calvinists, Puritans, and other dissenters emerging before the Civil War. These elements were energized by the constant republication of *Acts and Monuments*. This work helped provide a pedigree for reaction against the church of Charles and Laud and was a ground for iconoclasm during the Civil War. The frontispiece (A-47) shows Roman Catholics (on the right of the viewer, but the left of the print denoting the lost side) beguiled by priests, rosaries, procession, and the Mass being consigned to hell. But on the left (the right of God in the illustration), God’s Protestant Englishman read spiritual works, discuss sermons, and are martyred for their faith. They will enjoy the bliss of heaven by the rejection of popery and its foul habits and heresies.

The use of print in early modern England was not restricted to critics of the papacy or to iconoclasts. On the contrary, those who embraced image also used print. One such example is the use of the print media to install a sense of immediacy for the reconstruction and redemption of such great buildings as St. Paul’s Cathedral. In this case, prints were used to further artistic renovation and to persuade elements of the hierarchy of both the church and state to artistic action. A painting with its dedication shown on its frame was created by John Gipkyn for Henry Farley in 1616. Pamphlets for the Society of Antiquaries included reproduction of this diptych
that depicts Old St. Paul’s in a dilapidated condition on one side, and then a renovated state on the other. Pamphlets published by Farley in 1616 and 1621 make it evident that the painting was intended to be presented to James I as an eloquent petition for the restoration of the building.\textsuperscript{121} Print would be used as propaganda for the creation of art as well as for its destruction; however, those who were anti-art significantly outnumbered those who were pro-art.

**Travel, Patronage, and Collecting**

James was a more consistent patron of the arts than Elizabeth had been. With the accession of James I, religious images started to regain their popularity because of the more cosmopolitan religious mindset of this monarch.\textsuperscript{122} Unlike Elizabeth, James visited an important court outside of the British isles, Denmark. Denmark was Lutheran, not Calvinist. James was an iconophile in private though in public he often denounced Papists for their idolatry (while at the same time negotiating with them and accepting gifts of art). He could however make a clear distinction between idol, and image as reported by the shrewd courtier John Chamberlain who recorded in his diary items that James took along on a trip to Scotland. Chamberlain commented that James often traveled with his personal chapel, which was embellished “with pictures of the Apostles, Saints, Faith, Hope and Charitie, and such other religious representations . . . how welcome they

\textsuperscript{121} Henry Farley, *The complaint of Paules to all Christian soules, or, An humble supplication, to our good King and nation, for her new reparation written by Henry Farley* (London: For Laurence L'isle, and are to bee sold at his shop in Pauls Church-yard at the Turkes-head, 1616).

\textsuperscript{122} George Yule, “James VI and I: Furnishing the Churches in his Two Kingdoms” in Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (eds.), *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honor of Patrick Collinson* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1994). This is a constant theme in this article.
Chamberlain also knew the controversial nature of religious imagery not only in England but also in Scotland.

James was a lover of his own image and the image of favorite courtiers. He had as many if not more portraits painted of himself than Elizabeth did and often had many portraits painted of his favorites. Though his artistic output and collection were no match for the splendor of the court of his successor Charles (or his wife Anne and deceased son Henry), James employed important artists and artisans for the virtuous enrichment and aggrandizement of his court. One of the central issues of this study is that James made a more conscious effort-- and more so by Charles--to use image and architecture than any of the previous Protestant monarchs of England or many in other contemporary Protestant kingdoms in Europe. This was a “policy” to illustrate and justify their prerogative to rule as divine right monarchs. James and Charles chose to use art for what they perceived as a “virtuous” stabilizing factor for their reigns. They also used art as a way to shape their public and private image as monarchs who taught (if not achieved) Absolutism. Though James was involved to a lesser degree using portraiture and artwork than in the court masque and limited building projects, he was clearly more open to the possibilities and the public use of art than was Elizabeth. He used art to inform his court and his country about his own personal virtue and his vision of Divine Monarchy.¹²⁴

This willingness to look backward past the early Reformation to the use of art and architecture, as it had been before England’s reform and to the renewed and reinvigorated use by great Catholic powers, distinguished James significantly from Elizabeth. His gradual preferment


¹²⁴ Examples of this are examined in the following chapters.
of Arminians to high-church positions at school, as well as dioceses, would also be significant for the changing view of the use of art for propaganda in his other realm, the church. These anti-Calvinists again began to patronize the arts for specifically ecclesiastical commissions, as prelates had never sponsored during Elizabeth’s time.\(^{125}\) Anti-Calvinist church leaders significantly moved the spectrum of the English Church toward a more traditional and Catholic use of art in the Church of England. Laudians and other conservative collectors and patrons shared in the monarchy’s efforts to make art and ceremony once again important forces in the Church of England.

For James, Charles, or for any of the Arminians/Laudians, this move toward a new use of image is only possible because they left behind strict Calvinist iconoclastic views of the nature of art and architecture. They bypassed Reformed views and chose the old aesthetic that was revived through the Baroque resurgence on the continent. They ventured far beyond Elizabeth’s use of public imagery\(^ {126}\) as in the Bishops Bible (A-48) connecting themselves with monumental Imperial Catholic imagery as Otto II (A-49) meant for public consumption.\(^ {127}\)

\(^{125}\) This change in the hierarchy is examined along with their relationship to Absolutism, which was often preached by these churchmen along with their endorsement of “image.” These are central topics in the following chapters.

\(^{126}\) John King, *Tudor Royal Iconography. Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989). King discussed the use of Catholic Iconography and its reinterpretation and use by the Tudors throughout his text as a way to shore up Tudor power and prestige for both the Catholic queen Mary and the Protestant Tudors, especially Elizabeth. King noted that Protestant tracts reinterpreted this ancient iconography for use in the new religion. Elizabeth is portrayed from time to time as a Constantinian type; however, these were rooted in a thousand-year mideval tradition of rulership. Elizabeth never commissions monumental imagery. This substantially differentiates her from the Stuarts.

\(^{127}\) John King, 8-10.
From the perspective of those who were against imagery, one dangerous use of models, such as Constantine and Solomon, was the fact that traditions and scripture identified them with building and religious imagery. Solomon was the builder of the temple and of a great palace. Constantine was one of the greatest decorators and builders of the churches of antiquity in Rome, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. From a Calvinist view, some of this legacy was negative. Solomon is branded an idolater because he followed his wives’ religion.

When Solomon was old his wives had turned his heart to strange gods . . . . Solomon did evil in the sight of the lord; he did not follow him unreservedly as his father David had done. Solomon then built a high place to Chemosh, the idol of Moab, and to Molech, the idol of the Ammonites, on the hill opposite Jerusalem (I Kings, ch. 11 vs. 3-10).

He had strayed from the “pure” religion, so the legacy of Solomon was a mixed inheritance, especially considering that England’s Solomon also had a wife of a different religion.

Yet the imperial claims of Constantine and Charlemagne were too tempting not to be used even by committed Protestants. They were identified with the theme of translation, which was a concept that these two Christian rulers were seen as successors to David and Solomon. These figures were identified with the unification of the secular and spiritual concerns of the world.\(^\text{128}\) During the medieval period, which was rife with conflicts with the papacy, the theocratic notion of government was often infused with a millennial yearning for an imperial Davidic Kingship, a renovatio.\(^\text{129}\) The inherited status of the kingdom of Israel was claimed by the Holy Roman Empire, as well as Byzantium. As noted in Chapter 1, these claims were reissued by the Catholic monarchs of the Hapsburg family and to a lesser degree the Protestant Elizabeth and James. These assertions and images were slightly modified by Protestants.

\(^{128}\) John King, 11.

\(^{129}\) John King, 11.
Another factor that helped continue the use of this medieval imagery was the factor that legends surrounding Constantine spoke of his British heritage. Tudor and Stuart apologists focused on Constantine’s British lineage and the central role he played in the establishment of the Christian church. These imperial images were used extensively in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and were having another renaissance during the first half of the sixteenth-century by the papacy and Catholic monarchs such as the Hapsburgs.

The Grand Tour: Contact with the Catholic South.

According to Edward Chaney, one of the important influences that helped move British art toward the continental Catholic was travel. As noted in chapter 2 of this study, one of the beneficiaries of travel was Charles who went on a “jaunt” to Spain with Buckingham for the hand of the Spanish Infanta. By ending the war with Spain in 1604, and by actively working to make better relations with the great Catholic powers of Europe, James helped to usher in the beginning of what came to be known as the “Grand Tour.” Often important to this tour were English Roman Catholic priests such as Richard Lassels, alias Bolds, and a significant number of others of the old faith. Though technically Lassels was an exile the moment he entered Douai College in the Spanish Netherlands in 1623, he kept up many important connections with Catholics and more open-minded Protestants in England.130

Lassels and other English priests often had a difficult time finding work on the continent due to the abundance of available local priests. Well-educated English clergy, such as Lassels and Peter Fitton, became involved with teaching young Catholic Englishmen, and at times, young Protestant Englishmen about European, and in particular, Italian culture. Though

officially a “traitor,” Peter Fitton became England’s most important art agent-resident in Rome who helped the royal family, as well as important courtiers collect art.\textsuperscript{131} Fitton was also a close associate and acted as a personal agent in Rome to Queen Henrietta Maria periodically between 1638 and 1650.\textsuperscript{132} Other English Catholic priests, such as George Gage and Tobie Matthew, used their virtuosity in art to earn a living abroad while maintaining contacts to acquire works of art on behalf of the great pre-Civil War English collectors.\textsuperscript{133}

According to Anthony Wood (a contemporary of Lassels) in his \textit{Athenae Oxonienses}, Richard Lassels took

great delight in seeing foreign countries. . . traveled thro’ Italy five times as tutor to several of the English nobility and gentry, whereby obtaining great knowledge of place, men, manners and customs, was esteemed the best and surest guide or tutor for young men of this time, and drew up [itineraries and maps] for the use of them and others, that should come after.\textsuperscript{134}

Edward Chaney documented that the 1620s and 1630s were particularly important times for the establishment of an English presence in continental Europe in this growing tradition of the “grand tour”. This was possible because of the marriage of Henrietta Maria to Charles I. After the assassination of Buckingham, and the subsequent treaties of peace with France and Spain and the dissolution of Parliament, Henrietta Maria played an increasing role both in relations to her English co-religionists and in foreign affairs.\textsuperscript{135} She also became the excuse for “the ostentatious

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Edward Chaney, 19.}
\footnote{Edward Chaney, 26.}
\footnote{Edward Chaney, 19.}
\footnote{Anthony Wood, \textit{Athenae Oxonienses: An exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the University of Oxford.} . . (London: Rivington ed. P. Bliss, 4 Vols., 1813-1820), 818-819.}
\footnote{Edward Chaney, 41.}
\end{footnotes}
presence in London of priests, friars, and Papal envoys, her chapel being the focal point for a wave of conversions in fashionable court circles.\textsuperscript{136}

More than a few sophisticated Scots and Englishmen of the day, including some of the Puritan pro-French aristocracy, welcomed the \textit{rapprochement} with the continent.\textsuperscript{137} Many English travelers first took advantage of the initial peace treaty with Spain during James’s reign and the peace treaty during Charles’s travel to Europe. At times, the relationship between the Crown and Italian prelates became positively chummy. The hospitality of Cardinal Barberini (nephew of the Pope) made young Englishmen of good family welcomed and entertained when they visited Rome and the Papal States. Barberini’s hospitality became legendary.\textsuperscript{138} Even Church of England prelates shared in the cardinal’s kindness and emphasis on rapprochement with the English. John Williams, the bishop of Lincoln’s nephew, had been kindly entertained in Rome and proclaimed “Cardinal Barberini had done more to reclaim the northern kingdoms by his civilities than cardinal Bellarmine had ever done in by his writings”.\textsuperscript{139} Walter Montague also made two journeys to Rome with letters from his goddaughter, Henrietta Maria, to the pope, and described an extremely flattering reception in the Papal States. “Her joy [Henrietta Maria’s] had increased when she daily heard, that all the English who went thither were treated in the same manner, respectively to their character [religion]. . . . These extraordinary civilities to the

\textsuperscript{136} Edward Chaney, 41.
\textsuperscript{137} Edward Chaney, 41.
\textsuperscript{138} Edward Chaney, 41.
\textsuperscript{139} Edward Chaney, 41.
British nation were a common subject of conversation at court. Both the king and the nobility were pleased with it.”

Other important members of the court such as the highly cultivated Scot, George Conn, a canon of San Lorenzo in Damaso, had influence when he replaced Panzani as papal agent for Rome. Conn was more acceptable than Panzani because of his fluent English, his expert connoisseurship, and his lay status. He was given free access to Henrietta Maria and Charles, and he had a particularly close relationship with the Earl Marshal, Arundel, and the Duke of Buckingham’s Catholic widow. Many sought from the Italophile Arundel, or from his Catholic wife, or from the queen herself in the 1620s and 1630s letters of introduction for those intending to journey to Rome. They were “freely given to both Catholic and Protestant alike.”

Not all in England were happy with the expanding travel, trade, and rapprochement with Catholic Europe. Some of the Puritans who were more powerfully represented in the enlarged House of Commons of the 1620s observed with “mounting indignation what they regarded as the growing papist threat to both the political security and the religious integrity of God’s chosen

---


141 Edward Chaney, 42.

142 Edward Chaney, 42.

143 Edward Chaney, 41.

144 Edward Chaney, 41. Numerous references to English travelers and another source of recommendation are to be found in A. S. F., *Archivio Mediceo*, vols. 4189 et. Seq., in the letters of Amerigo Salvetti to the Grand Duke’s secretary at Florence. These reveal that Florence was deliberately improving hospitality where British visitors were concerned. The reason for this was related to the campaign to win the Stuart court over to Catholicism, but also for Florence to be involved with the ever-expanding and important English trade.
nation.”\textsuperscript{145} However, most of these were ignorant of the king’s “immovable loyalty to his Anglican Church and Laud’s opposition to Conn and often-fiery denunciations of the Roman party in Privy Council meetings by Laud and others.”\textsuperscript{146} Many of these parliamentary members fed notions of papal takeover of the English Church or imminent conversion of the king to Catholicism. London’s anti-Catholic masses were ready to believe any conspiracy by the archbishop, the king, or the queen to be involved in any Popish Plot. “Anything associated, however remotely, with Rome, or indeed the Catholic continent in general, was slandered in pamphlet and pulpit with increasing vigor”\textsuperscript{147} during the 1630s. These ferocious attacks also included the art collected and produced by the court.

\textbf{Conclusion}

The use of image did not have a cohesive ideology during the reign of Elizabeth or early reign of James as it did for their contemporaries in the Catholic south. This began to change in the second decade of James’s rule. Chapter 4 will further document this change. However they both somewhat embraced art, especially portraiture and they collected some art. But no evidence shows that Elizabeth ever collected any religious works or used monumental works to express ideology.

Iconoclasm was an isolated but real threat to the public works of art, especially church art, during the late Tudor age and reoccurred even in the Stuart age. This was due in fact to the preaching of Elizabethan bishops and confusing directives from the Crown about the function of images in the Church of England. A controversy of what constituted a “graven image” was

\textsuperscript{145} Edward Chaney, 41.

\textsuperscript{146} Edward Chaney, 41.

\textsuperscript{147} Edward Chaney, 41.
reflected in the tangled web of legal policy constructed under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and
Elizabeth I. Elizabeth’s injunctions of 1559 were moderate, when compared to Edward’s
previous injunctions. Visitation articles framed by her leading clergy usually followed the more
radical notion that acted in favor of iconoclasm.

This line between ‘moderate’ and ‘radical’ positions was constantly shifting, but we can
identify certain crucial points of reference in demarcating the boundaries. Moderates
tended to focus on the social function of an image; was it the object of pilgrimage, of
offering, or adoration? Radicals condemned not only ‘abused’ images, but images in
themselves.  

Moderate homilists of the Elizabethan age recognized a greater danger in sculpture than in flat
painting but

The radical iconoclast was increasingly marked by a rejection of images less obviously
prone to idolatry, such as stained glass windows. Given the discrepancies in ‘the network
of ecclesiastical articles and injunctions, parliamentary statues and royal proclamations,’
actual practice varied from church to church across the realm, and iconoclasm itself could
become ‘nine-tenths of the law.’

Elizabeth’s own personal use of art was pale in comparison to monarchs such as her father and
contemporaries on the continent. Much of this is due to religious pressures by advancing
Protestantism during her reign. But she took a rather conservative view about the use of art in her
own private chapels and was personally not an iconoclast. Yet Elizabeth did not construct or
decorate any major building or monument, cycle of paintings or reliefs, or statuary that could be
construed as proclaiming her as an absolutist or her own tendencies of religious conservatism.

148 Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge

149 Tessa Watt, 133-134.
Painting in Elizabethan England was almost completely devoid of religious themes. Tombs built during Elizabeth’s reign, with the exception of Catholic tombs, were stripped bare of anything that connected with medieval Catholic iconography. Almost no Christian elements remained in the tombs with the exception of biblical quotations often in Latin or English. Angels, saints, and instruments of the passion all faded away and did not return with any consistency until the middle part of the reign of James I. By the end of his reign in 1625 angels, virtues, and other religious symbols became commonplace. One of the factors that help to revive religious symbols was the official Stuart tomb of Mary Queen of Scots. The incorporation of angels and marks of the passion on the first official tomb of the new dynasty clearly give permission to use, once again, medieval Catholic ornaments on their tombs.

A new and more continental mode of collection and patronage emerged in the last decade of Elizabeth’s reign, but blossomed in the reign of James I because of peace with the Hapsburgs and the ability to travel to the continent safely. Those who traveled were likely positively influenced by the tremendous flourishing of art occurring in Italy, France, and Spain during the first days of the Baroque. Charles I was one of these travelers who took advantage of this time of peace and attempted reconciliation. It seems clear that he was positively influenced (as far as image was concerned) by his journey to Spain. However, not all were convinced this time that socialization with England’s traditional enemies was positive for England.

The fear of anything connected to the old religion, the quality and number of conversions at court, and the scorn for almost all forms of “music, masques, plays, sport, dancing, painting, modern architecture, most forms of non-theological literature, Arminianism, episcopal government, over high status for women, peace with the Habsburgs, long hair, may-poles,
foreigners in general and foreign travel in particular” was of grave concern for many pamphleteers in early modern England and many parliamentarians. The godly Calvinists of London had split English society and prefigured the Puritan Revolution to come. It is clear that considerable resentment existed toward the more liberal view of society and culture being expounded and contemplated by James and then more radically by Charles and a significant number within his court. English society was ready, for all practical purposes, to divide even before the Scots War and Civil War began.

Figure 3-1. Gerrit Berckheyde, 1650, *View of St. Bavo’s Haarlem*. National art Gallery, Washington D. C. Photo by author.

Figure 3-2. William and Cornelius Cure: *Tomb of Queen Elizabeth I and Mary I*, 1612 Westminster Abby, Lady Chapel. Photo by author.
Figure 3-3. Detail of Sarcophagus lid *Tomb of Queen Elizabeth I*. Photo by author.

Figure 3-4. *Mary Stuart* (died 1607) Our Lady Chapel, Westminster Abby, London. Photo by author.
CHAPTER 4
JAMES I: VIRTUE, ART AND POLITICS IN EARLY STUART ENGLAND

Introduction

Virtue was a contested and desirable attribute in the life of the ruler. After publication of Machiavelli’s *The Prince*, and the use of its less-than-virtuous methods (at least from a Christian perspective), many rulers tried to gain the “high ground” and associate themselves with the virtues of ancient and medieval Christianity as well as classical antiquity. These were often “imaged” by earlier Christian monarchs. As presented in the study of the Catholic monarchies examined in Chapter 1, Catholic rulers often sought to gain reputations of virtue through personal writing, enhancement of ancestry, collection of art, creation of art and through building or renovation of important dynastic centers or shrines in an attempt to buttress their theory of Divine Right Rule. Many of these monarchies made virtue literally “concrete” through visual culture. Therefore, virtue was not always an ethereal matter but was laid down in paint or stone and mortar in great buildings and artworks. The kings of the Hapsburg dominions, the French monarchy, and the papacy spent vast sums extolling their religious and secular virtues as monarchs. This was a continuation of Renaissance self-fashioning of rulership. This idea was enhanced in the Baroque Age to new heights of patronage and expression.

This self-fashioning was also a repudiation of Machiavellism and its ideal, a ruthless and often anti-Christian prince. James I, in his political writings and in his later “experiments” with art, connected his own thought processes about art and architecture to earlier and contemporary examples best expressed in Catholic Europe. This chapter will begin with an examination of one of his most important writings, the *Basilikon Doron* and will end with a discussion of artworks that James had created during his reign within the context of Absolutist art and self-fashioning. Connections and similarities with Catholic thought, iconography and artistic “practice” will be
made in relationship to the *Basilikon Doron*, including slightly earlier and contemporary Catholic thought about rulership and art, and artworks commissioned or endorsed by James.

Included in this chapter will be factors that helped to “move” James toward the use of art in the second half of his reign, including memorials for members of his family, marriage plans for Prince Henry, and James’s vision of an “Imperial London” to rival other imperial cities on the continent. Following this discussion there will be a brief examination of important thinkers who have been described as “English Catholics.” These figures were influential in politics, religion and art during the reign of James. Evidence will be presented that these religious thinkers were not “novel,” nor did they follow Calvinist theology. Their spectrum is best described as “anti-Calvinist” especially in their tastes for art, decoration and celebration in the English Church. These church figures were influential in the planning of royal chapels built in the early 1620s, which were a repudiation of Puritan plain style and were controversial at their making. Finally, a monumental sculpture at Oxford will be examined for its importance in the context of Stuart absolutism.

*Basilikon Doron*

As an answer to the portrait of rulership envisioned in *The Prince* and the reality of the times—that rulership was questioned ever more by religious dissidents, political innovations and economic upheavals, along with new political challenges—the Catholic monarchies of this period allied themselves with the theory of absolutism as a model of government to stabilize their kingdoms. Likewise, James argued for absolutism in most of his political or theological writings, particularly in *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* and *Basilikon Doron*. *Basilikon Doron* is a book of practical advice rather than abstract theory. It portrayed the principles of *Trew Law* without bothering to prove them through long philosophical argument. *Basilikon*
“took for granted that the king alone made all final decisions on foreign and domestic policy, and it laid particular emphasis upon his supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs.”\(^1\) The virtuous rule by God’s Lieutenant, the Divine Right of Kings, became the most important political expression, which significant Catholic theologians wrote about as the response to the religious crisis of the day as well as the shifting world of religion, knowledge, discovery, and politics. This also led to great works of art, which proclaimed the virtue and right of the king to rule. James initially chose another route by expressing his notion of kingly virtuosity through authorship; eventually he embraced monumental building and image making.

*Basilikon Doron* was primarily a treatise of advice to his sons on government. However, it had a secondary audience in mind, those who had moderate Christian views and were familiar with the tradition of *Fürstenspiegel* or *speculum principis*. This tradition gave guidance to young princes concerning conduct, ethics and discharge of office; these works also dealt with issues of state and society and are rooted in antique, early Christian, and medieval treatises. Erasmus wrote such a work with very similar themes and outcomes, *The Education of a Christian Prince*.\(^2\) The aim of *speculum principis* tradition works, such as Erasmus’s, were to give justification and guidance for monarchy and examples of just rule. They pulled from the traditions of Greek, Roman and Medieval texts on political discourse as their main sources along with the thought of church fathers. The Old Testament, and its lengthy comments on kingship, also influenced this genre. James, like Erasmus, was trying to influence a greater audience than his sons in England with this type of literary work. This literary tradition also had English

\(^1\) Johann P. Sommerville, *King James VI and I Political Writings*, xix.

examples such as John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus*. However, because this was written by a father and dedicated to his sons it had more influence on them than a work created by a trusted servant or an author seeking employment.

John of Salisbury and his work *Policraticus* (completed in 1159), was one such work by a bishop for a king. John’s aim was to discuss all aspects of ethical and political life. *Policraticus*’s topics vary from whether it is permissible to kill a tyrant or to tell off-color jokes at dinner parties. In the course of developing and elaborating his ideas, John rarely develops an explicit argument. Instead, he presents many examples, giving various excerpts from classical and sacred authorities. By illustrating that many wise men held an opinion; the rest of us should agree and be led to similar conclusions.

John’s imagery was that the state was like the human body. It was an organic, integrated whole, unified for the good of its members. Each office, or role in the society, is a part of the state. The state can be divided into three tiers: first, those who exert some governmental authority, second, those who perform governmental functions, and third, everyone who is governed but not part of government. The prince is its head, with governors and judges acting as the eyes and mouth, the parliament acts as the heart, and the church the soul. The second tier is officials who make up the bureaucratic machine of government and are compared to internal organs. The flanks are the courtiers. The remainders, or third tier, are the peasants and artisans, rather than any kind of merchant middle class. These peasants are the feet.

The prince, not the parliament or church, wields political authority. The parliament has an advisory role, but John had very little to say about it except that members should be virtuous and
wise old men. What John saw as the relation between church and state is difficult to grasp. The purpose and goals of a just state are not exactly equal with those of the church, nor are the goals in conflict; they simply differ. The higher goal is that of the church, salvation. The secular state has its own goals. Between the church and the state, John describes a hierarchy of function, but he does not subordinate state to church or church to state. The spiritual authority of the church is higher. It was a more noble form of authority than the coercive secular authority of the prince, but secular authority is conferred on the prince by God, not by the church. The church has not outsourced this function by granting secular authority to the prince.

As for the prince, John has a very high standard for his character and conduct. According to the invented “Institutes of Trajan”, there are four responsibilities or duties of the prince: to revere God, to love his subjects, to have self-discipline, and to educate his officials. The prince’s love of God and love of his subjects was shown by a subjugation of his will to the will of God for the good of his people. However, given that the people or God are not always “forthcoming”, the prince must be able to read and to reflect on divine law. By performing this daily reflection, the prince conformed his will to the divine will. Therefore the prince merely wills what is just. The prince, whose will is in conformity with the divine will, can expect to be obeyed. As to the power of the church John’s modes of relation between king and priesthood

---


4 Cary J. Nederman, (tr.) *Policraticus*, 68.

5 Cary J. Nederman, 40.

6 Cary J. Nederman, 44.

7 Cary J. Nederman, 216.
resists any sort of institutional subjection of the secular government by the visible church. The submission of kings to priests is purely a voluntary act and the church may best be characterized as acting in an advisory way.

Another such work is Grialdus Cambrensis’s *De Principis Instructione* written about 1217. In this work, he noted, “it is better…to be loved than to be feared by subjects. Yet it is essential to be feared somewhat provided that the fear is engendered in admiration and not coercion: for whatever is loved in tender affection must be of consequence also be feared.”

Love became a major theme in the *Basilikon Doron*. In fact, James I echoed this theme in his writings as well as his actions and justifications by showering affection on favorites. Art followed literary imagery in early seventeenth-century English artwork. Friedrich Polleross noted that examples of relationships between models showed this type of relationship between the patron and subject. For instance, The Duke of Buckingham was painted as St. Stephen in a work, which no longer exists and showed a “reverence” of king James I for his favorite. The connection between religion and love seems to have gained particular significance in seventeenth-century England. When criticized by jealous parliamentarians, James defended his relationship to Buckingham by noting, “You may be quite sure that I love the Earl of Buckingham more than any other . . . and it cannot be considered a mistake if Jesus Christ did the same. . . Christ had his John and I have my George.”

---


10 Friedrich Polleross, 81.
William Perrault’s *De Eruditione Principum* continues with the same themes of these earlier works. Charity is also emphasized by Perrault. The prince should be loved by his subjects and give of his own goods to help them, protecting them from oppressions and evils. “The prince should realize that unto the poor was given the Kingdom of Heaven….From such a relation as outlined; there will be mutual faith and dependence between the prince and his subjects.”¹¹ Faith is extremely important for the prince as it is with other writers in this review. Perrault also emphasized the organic analogy of the prince as head and higher than the rest of the body. However, adds that the body after all sustains the head. “The prince should often stop to think what his is…he should be of good character…mild, truthful, just in his relations to subjects and content with his income.”¹² Clemency makes the difference between a prince and a tyrant but above all the prince should be wise as to the use of his power. “For the greatness of power is not in its magnitude, but in its laudable application and the task of the prince is not to burden, but to help his people.”¹³

The final medieval author to be mention is this review is Thomas Occleve. His poem *De Regimine Principis*, which contained over 5000 lines of English verse, was written around 1411. This work, such as the others, argued for a prince that should follow divine laws, “be of unquestioned morals and surpass his people in virtue. He should be continent, temperate, self-restrained and magnanimous…merciful …but without mercy to tyranny.”¹⁴ Above all, justice should be the nature of the prince as justice is the nature of God.

¹¹ Lester Kruger Born, 486.

¹² Lester Kruger Born, 485.

¹³ Lester Kruger Born, 485-486.

¹⁴ Lester Kruger Born, 500.
Common veins of thought are evident in this two-century period of political and religious advice to princes. All authors see an “organic analogy” which symbolized the interdependence of the king and the governed. Equally important were the concepts of peace, unity and harmony. Another thing they have in common was that every one of these treatises were dedicated or written for the prince, not by the prince. For these authors, Christian goodness is the one great remedy for the woes of mankind and flawed politics. The final theme that connects most of these medieval writers was that the prince was bound by divine law. It was clear the prince must answer for his conduct before the law of God and to God.

Another well known work in the tradition of Fürstenspiegel or speculum principis, already mentioned briefly, is Erasmus’s The Education of a Christian Prince. This work was written within three years of Machiavelli’s Prince. Erasmus lived during the Reformation, which led Martin Luther to embark upon Protestantism and reject the authority of the Pope. Meanwhile others remained committed to reforming the Church from within. Erasmus was a reforming Catholic dedicated to the latter cause. He consistently criticized certain contemporaneous popular Christian beliefs, abuses, and practices. Yet he remained committed to Catholic doctrines such as that of free will, which Protestant reformers rejected in favor of the doctrine of predestination.

This middle road attitude disappointed and even angered many Protestants, such as Luther, as well as some of the more conservative elements in the Catholic Church. While rejecting and attacking abuses of the contemporary Roman Curia, such as abuse of power and lack of discipline among the clergy, Erasmus never sided fully with Protestantism and remained a critical, yet faithful Catholic. Erasmus died in Basel in 1536. Unfortunately and rather unfairly,
the Council of Trent “placed Erasmus in the first category of heretics, and put all his works on the index of prohibited books.”

Erasmus’s *Institutio principis Christiani (Education of a Christian Prince)* (Basel, 1516) was written as advice to the young king Charles of Spain, later Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor. Erasmus applied the general principles of honor and sincerity to the special functions of the Prince, whom he represents throughout as the servant of the people. This work was opposed to Machiavelli who stated that, to maintain control by political force, it is safer for a prince to be feared than loved. Erasmus preferred that the prince was loved and suggested that the prince needed a well-rounded education in order to govern justly and benevolently and avoid becoming a source of oppression. For Erasmus, like others in this tradition of literature, the tried and true virtues identified by medieval writers were the cure for emerging anti-Machiavellianism. Both works by Erasmus and Machiavelli were written in answer to the “moral panic” generated by the political instability of the times. However, they came to very different conclusions. Erasmus pointed out that the prince should realize that good deeds are the best means to achieving and maintaining a good reputation. The princes should always keep this in mind because he is readily imitated by his people. Erasmus wrote:

> Among the various qualities necessary for the good prince are wisdom and integrity, continence and clemency, devotion to his people, self-restraint, interest in truth and liberty, freedom from the vices of cruelty and pride and the careful avoidance of flatterers. The prince should be like God in his manners and qualities. He should learn from association with wise men.

---


Basilikon Doron is very close to Erasmus’s work and was intended for a general audience of like minded moderate thinkers. Yet an equally important audience included his sons Henry and Charles I. Charles’s name was chosen to honor the emperor Charles V. This was intended to please and flatter the Spanish monarchs of the day; again, James was reaching out in hope for some kind of political accommodation.

**Basilikon Doron’s Family Context**

Basilikon Doron was written when James was king of Scotland. The title, Basilikon Doron, Greek for “royal gift,” or “imperial gift,” was written in the form of a private and confidential letter to the king’s eldest son, Henry, Duke of Rothesay, born in 1594. After the premature death of Prince Henry, James gave the letter to his second son, Charles, with no significant revisions. It was first printed in Edinburgh in 1599, later in London in 1603, and again after the death of Prince Henry in 1612; however copies “escaped” early on.

Basilikon Doron repeats the argument for the “Divine Right of Kings” as set out in the Trew Law of Free Monarchies. The letter warns against Papists and Puritans as fanatics, but is much harsher and lengthy in its criticisms of Puritans or Presbyterians, who James does not distinguish as separate. These “Puritans” had caused political and religious instability for James in Scotland, Catholics had not, and in fact, many of his most faithful supporters were the supporters of his mother. When one examines his fear of the polarized extremes of the Christian church, more than five times the amount of ink was used to warn readers about the “iniquities” of Puritans compared to the “fanaticism” of Catholics. Historians or literary critics have not noted
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17 Johann P. Sommerville translates this as “royal gift,” Florin Curta suggests a more literal translation should be “imperial gift.” If Curta is correct, that meant that James was already thinking about imperial titles before he became king of England while writing this in Scotland.
this significant disparity, but they pointed out that Charles always kept a copy of this work by his
bedside.

Governance and proper maintenance of the Church is a recurring theme in the *Basilikon Doron*. James, unlike many of the earlier writers of this literary genre differs in his claim to be head and supreme governor in religion. As time went on James’s movement of the English church became more traditional and he defended his right to move the church as he willed as its “father.” He also moved it toward a more traditionally pre-reformed polity with emphasis on sacraments, which called for a more magnificent setting for the English Eucharistic service, and other sacraments. One must note that primarily Puritans objected to the use of religious or classical arts and not the Roman Catholics of his dominions, nor the Arminians and anti-Calvinists or “Anglicans,” who would emerge later to challenge Calvinism. James would “deed” the English Church to this emerging group by the time of his death. Scholars note the importance of *Basilikon Doron* to Charles ideological formation.

**The Sources for *Basilikon Doron***

The education of James was not in any way a crash course on Absolutism. Scots, whose task was to ingrain in the young monarch his limits as a king, educated him. George Buchanan was his most important tutor. James was fed a different “diet” of scholarship by George Buchanan than contemporary southern rulers were. Buchanan was an outspoken critic of royal Absolutism. Andrew Melville, like Buchanan, was a critic who held that James was accountable to the church in religious and moral matters. This was completely rejected by James; therefore, his primary schoolmasters could not be the major sources for *Basilikon Doron* for James’s religious or political policies. He certainly did not take their advice on governance of the church. After reaching his majority, James consistently and efficiently increased royal power at the
expense of the Presbyterian Church and the nobility of Scotland. This success in directing the Scottish church was due to his skilled political sense and ability to negotiate strongly with others. Most of the Protestant thinkers of his day in Scotland objected to the “encroachment” by the monarchy on the church. Therefore, one must look to “Protestant” absolutists or to the anti-Machiavellian “Catholic” philosophers and theologians on the continent as sources for James’s thought. (Both the Protestant and Catholic thinkers may have changed sides more than once.) The other sources were the many earlier works on the role of monarchy and virtue in government noted in the review at the beginning of this chapter. The only other possibility, which seems extremely remote, is that James came to these ideas by himself.

It is known that James’s library included the *Six Livres de Republique* of the French absolutist Jean Bodin. Bodin was a prime example of an early modern thinker who was sympathetic to Protestantism but who never officially left the Catholic Church. They did diverge on matters of religion and a few finer points, but James and Bodin plainly belonged to the same family of thought.¹⁸ Both James and Bodin were proponents of a moderated absolutism. This point is made by Sommerville as he wrote “despite the major differences in their political thought, both Hobbes and Locke were able to praise James, for the king combined absolutist principles with an emphasis upon the monarch’s duty to rule according to law and the public good. The king’s political philosophy was nuanced, moderated absolutism.”¹⁹ The same general theme expressed in *Fürstenspiegel* or *speculum principis* literature, which he likely had in his library, was this moderate absolutism, where the monarch was responsible to God and could not

¹⁸ Johann Sommerville, ed., *King James VI and I Political Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), xxviii. All quotations from *Basilikon Doron* are from this text.

¹⁹ Johann Sommerville, xv.
rule as a tyrant. It is clear that James was familiar with at least one of his contemporary Catholic absolutist writers in that he did reject Christianized stoicism, one of the premises that Justus Lipsius supported as a way out of Christian sectarianism and violence.\textsuperscript{20}

Many early modern Scottish thinkers, such as John Knox and Buchanan, taught that kings (and queens as in the case of Mary of Scotland) could be and should be deposed for religious reasons or because of tyranny or virtuous defect. James’s early “experiences in Scotland alienated him from the thinking of such men as Knox and Buchanan. He also vigorously rejected Catholic theories which legitimated the use of force by subjects against their sovereigns.”\textsuperscript{21}

These Catholic thinkers believed that the pope had greater powers of jurisdiction than any other sovereign. Therefore, popes could depose an unjust ruler or one who had lapsed into heresy. Robert Bireley labeled other thinkers who remained, for the most part, in the Catholic camp as anti-Machiavellians. These intellectuals were absolutists who disagreed with the papal right of deposition.\textsuperscript{22} As the earlier authors mentioned, they emphasized the virtuous life and rule of prince as the best means to heal the political and religious breaches of their day.

The anti-Machiavellians wrote in mainly Hapsburg territories, but also in Italy and France, and showed respect for the papacy but argued for royal power to stabilize kingdoms. James was influenced by or certainly agreed with these earlier and contemporary writers. He

\textsuperscript{20} Johann Sommerville, 41. Lipsius was a famous humanist and classical scholar who revived stoic thought in his \textit{De Constantia} of 1594. In James’s mind, he was “inconsistent” in that he taught at Calvinist Leiden University from 1578–1591, yet was received back into the Catholic Church and was a professor at Catholic Louvain from 1592 until his death.

\textsuperscript{21} Johann Sommerville, xvi-xvii.

\textsuperscript{22} Robert Bireley, \textit{The Counter-Reformation Prince: Anti Machiavellianism or Catholic Statecraft in Early Modern Europe} (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990). This is a common theme of all the anti-Machiavellian literature in regards to respect for the papacy, but a denial of the right of deposition.
argued consistently that the greatest defect of Catholicism was papal interference in the sovereign states of Europe. In fact, he rarely described the other defects of the Catholic Church in any of his political writings with the exception of his political and theological duel with Cardinal Robert Bellarmine over the Oath of Allegiance. The group within Catholicism to which he had a visceral reaction was the Jesuits. The Jesuits took a personal oath of loyalty to the pope and mounted a counter-offensive to reclaim England and Scotland clandestinely. They, of course, were often close to if not openly seditious and they were vociferous proponents of the power of papal deposition.

James held that the monarchy possessed a monopoly of political power within the state, which was derived from God alone. Many Catholic thinkers held this conviction in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Because of this monopoly of power, any active resistance to a king was always sinful. The only exception to this was if one was ordered by the king to disobey the commands of God. Even then, if the king punished the subject for disobedience, the subject had to accept the punishment inflicted by the monarch.

When *Basilikon Doron* was published, it was one of the most popular books in early modern Britain. It was also well received on the continent. That a work by a Protestant prince was received well by Catholic monarchs should not be surprising, as it shared much of the agenda of other rulers who admired absolutist theory. However, this work was not always received well by James’s fellow Protestants. The Scotsman Melville drew up a list of eighteen objections to the text. His criticisms were presented to the Synod of Fife in 1599, but the text was
never censored, as James intervened and the book went unchallenged in Scotland. This was a prime example of his ability to gain control of the church.

_Basilikon Doron_, with its practical advice rather than abstract theory, assumed the major principles of the _Trew Law of Free Monarchies_ without trying to prove them. His advice to Henry and later to Charles was that the king alone is responsible for final decisions on foreign and domestic policy and has supremacy in all ecclesiastical affairs. This emphasis on the importance of being supreme governor of the church was due to James’s rather unpleasant experience of Presbyterianism and Puritanism in Scotland. He was to encounter this same spirit of religious independence in disappointed Puritans after the failure of the Hampton Conference to change the English Church into a Presbyterian institution. Here James demonstrated that he would not give in on key elements of polity. His famous statement “no bishops, no kings” came out of his experience at the Hampton Conference.

James also contributed to religious controversies, with Catholics as well as Puritans, and Presbyterians. After the failed Gunpowder Plot and the deaths of Henry III and Henry IV at the hands of religious fanatics in France, James concentrated on a debate with other European thinkers and rulers on the power of the papacy to depose kings. James’s work, _Triplici Nodo, Tiplex Cuneus, Or an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance_ was answered by Pope Paul V in a breve, which forbade Catholics to take the Oath of Allegiance. The Oath of Allegiance was used to regulate and punish popish recusants who were seen as seditious. This oath contained a renouncement of the pope’s claim to be able to depose kings and to release subjects from loyalty to their sovereigns. James answered the objections of Paul V and Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, who ordered Catholics not to take the oath. Throughout most of this give and take, James argued
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in Triplici Nodo and in Premonition of his Maisties, to all most Mightie Monarchies, Kings, free Princes and States of Christendom of 1609 that the pope did not have powers to depose. However, even though James did have some objections to some of the elaborate ceremonies, the continued cult of the saints, and some of the “superstitious” aspects of Roman Catholicism, he held that the Roman Church was a true church and the “mother Church” of his own state churches.\(^{24}\) This was a position that distinguished him from most Protestant thinkers, including his own archbishop, Bancroft.

**Analysis of Basilikon Doron and Influence on Charles I**

In his relatively short document, (by my own count), James I mentions some form of the word “virtue” more than seventy times. Virtue, showing virtue, teaching virtue, and having his subjects imitate the monarchy’s virtue in order to achieve a happy and contributive state is one of the strongest themes in this text. Basilikon Doron, like other works of this genre, portrayed James in a good light as a wise ruler who venerated the memory of his mother, Mary Queen of Scots, and to a lesser degree, Queen Elizabeth, and continues their good rule through the Christian virtues. In the preamble, he affirms that those who supported his mother were “so stedfastly trew to me in all my troubles, as these that constantly kept their allegiance to her in her time.”\(^ {25} \) This was primarily a Catholic camp within Scotland and England. James always valued highly those who had been loyal to Mary—like Secretary Maitland, soon to be chancellor; the Seton family, one of whom would be chancellor in the future; and

\(^{24}\) Anthony Milton, Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). Milton writes that James, to the consternation of Puritans, often said that Rome was the mother church (141, 264 fn, 276). Milton also documented that James also allowed for salvation in the Roman Church (136). James had argued this point before Parliament in 1605. (136 fn)

\(^{25}\) Johann Sommerville, 5.
Henry Howard, the future Earl of Northampton. And when he had the opportunity to do so, he erected the splendid tomb to her memory which now stands near that of Elizabeth in Westminster Abbey.\textsuperscript{26}

For James, one of the most important virtues for kingship was loyalty to one’s parents and preservation of good memories; this mirrors the other works of speculum principis as well. Though Mary was Catholic, James had her memory defended against his former tutors. He had Archbishop Spottiswoode of St. Andrewes, the principal clerical agent in the affairs of the Scottish Church; write an “official history” where Mary is portrayed in a good light.\textsuperscript{27} The lesson of family loyalty and upkeep of the “image” was one that Charles understood. This was shown in the careful preservation and continuation of his father’s image figuratively and then concretely in the monument to James at Whitehall.

Though James does not specifically charge his successors to follow contemporary southern rulers in great building projects or works associated with the upkeep of the Church, he nowhere criticized these works. The virtuous ruler portrayed in this letter is a man of works, as well as a man of spiritual qualities. Virtuous absolutes were to be men of action and leadership, charged by God to run all aspects of government. They were to show their inner virtue through good government and good stewardship of the church. Charles certainly could have interpreted the idea of the “public good” in his building projects for St. Paul’s and even in the Banqueting House, as it expressed and emphasized the stability of the monarchy envisioned by James. One of the major aims of the reign of Charles was to duplicate and build on his father’s success. It is a

\textsuperscript{26} Maurice Lee, \textit{Great Britain’s Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms} (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 98.

\textsuperscript{27} Maurice Lee, 33.
well-known fact, according to Charles’s biographers, that he often read *Basilikon Doron* and tried to emulate the ruler his father envisioned. Indeed the way that Charles chose to remember favorably his father was almost hero worship. This was particularly shown in the Banqueting House Ceiling.

**God Giues Not Kings the Stile of Gods in Vaine**

In the short introduction of *Basilikon*, James emphasized concepts like labor, honor, proportion, symmetry and harmony.28 These words carry a sense of virtue, but they are words that are also descriptive of ideals of Renaissance artistic culture. These words are often repeated throughout the rest of the document. In the introduction, he charges his son to keep this work with him always as a reminder of James and as a manual for proper kingship and right action. “I haue ouer you, that yee keepe it euer with you, as carefully, as Alexander did the Illiads of Homer. Yee will finde it a iust and impartiall consellour; neither flattering you in any vice, nor importuning you at vnmeete times.”29 Though this is obviously literary rhetoric, Charles seemed to have taken this rather literally according to most accounts. This was a very personal work for Charles that connected him to his father, something his biographers suggested he needed desperately.

James noted that there was one group he could trust who supported him in Scotland, those who had supported his mother. Many were Catholic. “Wherein I doe alledge my owne experience anent the Queene my mother; affirming, that I neuer found any that were of perfit aage the time of her reigne here, so stedfastly trew to me in all my troubles, as these that

28 Johann Sommerville, 2-3.

29 Johann Sommerville, 3.
constantly kept their allegiance to her in her time.”\textsuperscript{30} He reminded his readers to honor his and Anne’s memory as he had honored his mother’s memory (by the time this was given to Charles James had already completed the spectacular tomb of Mary Queen of Scots, Figures 1-1, 1-2, 1-3). James’s actions were in response to the many books written calling into question the virtue of Mary Queen of Scots.\textsuperscript{31} On pages 5 to 7 in \textit{Basilikon Doron}, James called into question the loyalty of the Puritans. They are called “ignorant, full of moral faults . . . when they contemme the Law and souereine authoritie”\textsuperscript{32} The contempt of the law is especially shown when Puritans question the king’s right to rule. He continues to question the Puritan’s self-righteousness in their understanding that they are the only ones fit for sacraments.\textsuperscript{33} Here James lumped Anabaptists with other sects whose greatest crime is to question the authority of kings.

James continued with a call for tolerance, for an end to argument over less important items such as clerical garb, what form ceremonies should take, and so forth. Like other earlier works of this genre, he aimed to engage moderate readers and bring them along on his virtuous path. He asked his successor to advance churchmen of learning and common sense in religious matters. Men chosen for high-church office must emphasize what is important and essential rather than squabbling about unimportant matters in religion.\textsuperscript{34} This, besides being excellent advice for his sons, also reveals one of the important intentions of this \textit{speculum principis} work; enticing moderates to search for common ground.

\textsuperscript{30} Johann Sommerville, 5.

\textsuperscript{31} Johann Sommerville, 5.

\textsuperscript{32} Johann Sommerville, 6.

\textsuperscript{33} Johann Sommerville, 6.

\textsuperscript{34} Johann Sommerville 7-8.
Here James reveals one of his major political intentions for dynastic unity with a Catholic princess rather subtly. He “hopes” for a Protestant match for his son, but notes that there are so few Protestant princesses worthy of the match that he most likely will have to settle for a Catholic bride. This revealed one of his long-term policies. James wanted to use dynastic marriages to shore up his moderate religious and political policies and to bring détente to the religious climate of Europe. James, as early as the late sixteenth-century, had his mind set on marriage to Catholic princesses for Henry. For him a match outside the Protestant faith would be an essential way to heal the religious divide.

The next six pages of Basilikon Doron are a discussion of faith and religion and James’s own view of faith as essentially a gift of God. However, he believed that in order to be maintained, it must be worked at through prayer. He felt prayer should come from the heart, and that talking to God was emotional (a rather Baroque Catholic notion found in the Council of Trent). He believed prayer should not be mechanical, such as the ignorant that merely follow a book. James particularly cautioned readers against the Puritans again, warning that one should avoid the prayer of the “vaine PharisaiCall puritanes, that thinke they rule him vpon their fingers: The former way will breede an vncouth coldnesse in you toward him, the other will breede in you a contempt of him.”

James, ever versatile in theology and rather difficult to classify, broke with common Calvinist theology and placed an emphasis on conduct as well as faith for judgment aligning himself with the speculum principis notions of good monarchy. “Remember therefore all your

35 Johann Sommerville, 16.

36 Johann Sommerville, 16.
actions, of the great account that yee are one day to make.”

James then continued on, warning of the two extremes: Charles must avoid the Papists, who bowed to the political authority of the pope; and the Anabapists and Puritans, who had their own convenient revelations or dreams that allowed them to go astray and ignore royal prerogatives on religion and matters of state. He finished his section on religion, that good rulers should not obsess over outer practices but must balance practice with an interior faith. However, the ruler was to give public witness to the mysteries of faith through their “deeds.” The exterior must be a reflection of the virtuous interior. The next section further connects *Basilikon Doron* to *speculum principis* texts:

> Keepe God more sparingly in your mouth, but abundantly in your heart: be precise in effect, but sociall in shew: kythe more by your deeds than by your wordes, the loue of vertue and hatred of vice: and delight more to be godly and vertuous indeed then to be thought and called so; expecting more for your praise and reward in heauen, then heere: and apply to all your outward actions Christs command, to pray and giue your almes secretly: So shal ye on the one part be inwardly garnished with trew Christian humilitie, not outwardly (with the proud Pharisie) glorying in your godlinesse; but saying, as Christ commandeth vs all, when we haue done all that we can, *Inutiles serui sumus*: And on the other part, yee shall eschew outwardly before the world, the suspition of filthie proude hypocrisie, and deceitfull dissimulation.

> In James’s own words, as well as with the literary tradition of *speculum principis*, the king must be a “genuine” example of Christian virtue for his people. This is not only a religion of the interior, but also includes the exterior, as long as it does not become a religion of show. The king must set the religious “tone” and be a heroic moral example for his people. These words of James are appealing to those who are looking for Christian virtue to extricate Europe from the excessive confessionalism of the Seventy Years War. His appeal to antique and
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39 Johann Sommerville, 19.
medieval texts, common in the literary tradition of his day, was an appeal to moderation and peace.

**Of a Kings Dvetie in His Office: The Second Booke**

Like the works of Erasmus or Hoccleve, James emphasizes loyalty to family and family legacy in *Basilikon Doron*. This was helpful in making claims to hegemony in Great Britain, but was also part of his own personal needs; he was essentially a man without a family until he married. Once again, he brought up this central theme of family in the second part of his work. He repeated to his heirs that they have a responsibility to protect the legacy of James, as James tried to protect the legacy and the virtue of his mother. He reminds readers that those who had served his mother were the most useful and trustworthy of any of James’s servants.

Pertinent to this study, the next important topic addressed by James was the rank and “ancient Priuiledges” of the church. It is clear that James believed that all churches needed to be reformed, including his own. “The naturall sickenesse that hath euer troubled, and beene the decay of all the Churches, since the beginning of the world, changing the candlesticke from one to another, as *Iohn* saith, hath beene Pride, Ambition, and Auarice.” James’s argument was aimed at those who inhabited the middle ground of religious spectrums. *Basilikon Doron* was a challenge to work towards the reform of all churches for religious détente as well as the way to gain salvation for the greatest number of people. He identifies the “fringe groups” within Catholicism and Protestantism as the greatest enemies of Christian unity.

---
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James justifies the reform against the Roman Catholic Church as “God’s will,” but argues that there were problems with the reform in Scotland because it was not accomplished by pious princes but by self-serving men. This is one of his most vigorous attacks on Presbyterianism and Puritanism, and it lasted for almost three pages.

Some fierie spirited men in the miniserie, got such a guiding of the people at the time of confusion, as finding the gust of gouernment sweete, they begouth to fantasie to themselves a Democratike forme of gouerment: and hauing (by the iniquitie of time) been ouerwell bated vpon the wracke, first my Grandmother, and next of mine owne mother, and after vsurping the liberitie of the time in my long minorite, setled themselues so fast vpon imagined Democracie as they fed themselue with hope to become Tribuni plebes: and so in a popular gouernment by leading the people by the nose, to beare the sway of all the rule . . . I was oftentimes calumniated in their populare Sermons, not for any euill or vice in me, but because I was a King, which they thought the highest euill. And because they were ashamed to professe this quarrel, they were busie to look narrowly in all my actions; and I warrant you a mote in my eye, yea a false report, was matter enough for them to worke vpon: and yet for all their cunning, whereby they pretended to distinguish the lawfulnesse of the office, from the vice of the person, some of them would sometimes snapper out well grossely with the trewth of their intentions, informing the people, that all Kings and Princes were naturally enemies of the libertie of the Church, and could neuer patiently beare the yoke of Christ.  

James’s attack on the extremities of Presbyterianism and Puritanism continued in this section with advice to his reader.

Sufficient prouision for their sustentation, a comely order in their policie, pride punished, humilitie aduanced, and they so to reuerence their superiours, and their flockes them, as the flourishing of your Church in pietie, peace, and learning, may be one of the chiefe points of your earthly glory, being euer alike ware with both the extremities; as well as yee represse the vaine Puritane so not to suffer proude Papall Bishops; but as some for their qualities will deserve to bee preferred before others, so chaine them with such bondes as may preserue that estate from creeping corruption.  

Here James also criticized the Roman church, or those who would follow the “pride” of popery. His major criticism of Catholicism was its declared independence from the authority of a
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In James’s view, kings had legal authority over church as well as state built upon his interpretation of natural law and scripture as well.

The *Basilikon Doron* continues in this section with a discussion of the noble classes. James encouraged pleasurable sports for the health of his subjects. “Sports” were not at odds with his understanding of religious practice. He gave a common guide for moderate celebrations that helped to build a more closely-knit community, and gave a backhanded compliment to Catholics in their emphasis on “good fellowship.”

In respect whereof, and therewith also the more to allure them to a common amitie among themselues, certain dayes in the yeere woul d be appointed, for delighting the people with publieke spectacles of all honest games, and exercise of armes: as also for conueening of neighbours, for entertaining friendship and heartliness, by honest feasting and merrinesse: For I cannot see what greater superstition can be in making playes and lawfull games in Maie, and good cheere at Christmas, then in eating fish in Lent, and vpon Fridayes, the Papists well vsing the one as the other: so that always the Sabboths be kept holy, and no vnlawfull pastime be vsed: And as this forme of contenting the peoples mindes, hath beene vsed in all well gouerned Republicks: so will it make you to performe in your gouernment that olde good sentence. *Onme tulit punctum, qui miscuit vile dulci.* [From Horace, De arte Poetica, He has won all the applause who has combined the useful with the pleasurable].

James sees little harm in celebrating fellowship with neighbors. This section is an endorsement of merriment that was part of the fabric of the country during its pre-Reformation past. James even notes that these practices, still part of the Catholic tradition of his day, were harmless and indeed beneficial to the maintenance of the social fabric for good communities.

In *Basilikon Doron*, James expressed an independent view of the Spanish. Unlike the English, who had a xenophobic outlook on the Hapsburg ruling houses on the continent, James lavished praise on the “Spaniard, whose great successe in all his warres, hath onely come
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through straitnesse of Discipline and order.”  

“This theme of a disciplined life is mentioned on the same page within the context that virtue and order are more important than armies.

“But is it not enough to be a good King, by the scepter of good Lawes well execute to goure, and by force of armes to protect his people; if he ioyne not therewith his virtuous life in his owne person, and in the person of his Court and company; by good example alluring his Subject to the loue of vertue, and hatred of vice. And therefore (my Sonne) sith all people are naturally inclined to follow their Princes example.”

Thus, virtue is to be active and visible. James reminds his successors that “except ye employ them [virtues], and set them on worke, for the weale of them that are committed in your charge: *Virtutis enim laus omnis in actione consistit.* [Cicero: for the whole merit of virtue lies in action].

It is only through action that the interior of the prince’s true self can be exposed to his people.

Once again, James reminded his sons and the general reader that they should choose for servants those who had served him well, as he chose those who had well served Mary Queen of Scots. James reminded them that one would be best served by preferring:

Their posteritie before others, as kindliest: so shall ye not onely be best serued, (for if the haters of your parents cannot loue you, as I shewed before, it followeth of necessitie their louers must loue you) but further, ye shall kyth your thankefull memorie of your father, and procure the blessings of these olde servants, in not missing their olde master in you; which otherwise would be turned in a prayer for me, and a curse for you. Vse them therefore when God shall call me, as the testimonies of your affection toward me; trusting and advancing those farthest, whom I found faithfullest: which ye must not discerne by their rewards at my hand (for rewards, as they are called *Bona fortunae*, so are they subject vnto fortune) but according to the trust I gaue them; hauing oft-times had better heart then hap to the rewarding of sundry; And on the other part, as I wish you to kyth your constant loue toward them that I loued, so desire I you to kyth in the same measure, your constant hatred to them that I hated: I meane, bring not home, nor restore not such, as ye finde standing banished or fore-faulted by me. The contrary would kyth in your ouer  
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great contempt of me, and lightnesse in your owne nature: for how can they be trew to the Sonne that were false to the Father? 49

Charles almost followed this advice to the letter. Toward the end of his reign, James would advance “Anglicans,” Arminians, and anti-Calvinists, the exact same group that Charles would continue to advance in the English Church. In addition, Buckingham, first noticed by Anne, would dominate the end of James’s reign and the beginning of Charles’s reign.

Once again, James singled out the Puritans for particular ridicule because of their hubris and false humilities.

And what is betwixt the pride of a glorious Nebuchadnezzar, and the preposterous humilitie of one of the proud Puritanes, claiming to their Paritie, and crying, Wee are all but vile wormes, and yet will iudge and giue Law to their King, but will be iudged nor controlled by none? Surely there is more pride vnder such a ones blake bonnet, then vnder Alexander the great his Diademe, as was said of Diogenes in the like case. 50

Here James uses literary works of the past to enhance the irony of the Puritanism of his day. Puritans claimed to be sober and obedient to the will and word of God, however, they often were the most political group challenging the status and the power of kings. In this comparison of them to Alexander the Great, he decries them as extremely hypocritical. James’s final bit of religious caution warns the reader of three distinct (at least in his mind) religious groups who deny the authority of kings.

James then reminded the reader that all virtues are related to statecraft.

But aboue all virtues, study to know well your owne craft, which is to rule your people. And when I say this, I bid you know all crafts: For except ye know euery one, how can yee control euery one, which is your proper office?...all Artes and sciences are linked euery one with other, their greatest principles agreeing in one (which moued the Poets to faine the nine Muses to be all sisters) studie them, that out of their harmonie, ye may
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sucke the knowledge of all faculties; and consequently be on the counsell of all crafts, that yee may be able to containe them all in order.\textsuperscript{51}

However, the major goal of this passage is to show off his knowledge of classical antiquity and literature. It also reveals the notion that the king is in charge of all the apparatus of the state and should not cede his authority. Another possible interpreted, by those who were friendly to the fine arts such as his sons, would be the justification for expressing virtue through the arts. Virtue could be expressed in a “Culture of Image” by the king as a “shaper” of the arts. In particular, Charles embraced the arts connected with the muses; including music, painting and sculpting. Both of his sons exceeded James in the study, patronage, and collecting of the arts.

Continuing on, James reminds his readership that the king should be completely in control of the church and that the church owed them obedience. “Suffer no conuentions nor meetings among Church-men, but by your knowledge and permission.”\textsuperscript{52} In addition, he reminded them to control the text in the pulpit and that they should never allow the preaching of the Word to be confused with preachers who “meddle in that place with the estate or policie; but punish seuerely the first that presumeth to it [meddle].”\textsuperscript{53}

James then moved on to the art of history and its necessity for well-educated and enlightened monarchs. Obviously, this text fit within the scope of such genre. He takes another swipe at Scottish Puritans for their “selective histories.”
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I would haue you to be well versed in authentik histories . . . but specially in our owne histories . . . I meane not of such infamous inuectiues, as Buchanans or Knoxes Chronicles: and if any of these infamous libels remaine vntill your dayes, vse the Law vpon the keepers thereof.\textsuperscript{54}

Discrediting these histories, which looked most unfavorably on the legacy of Mary Queen of Scots and other Stuarts, James recommended the works of antiquity, especially the \textit{Commentaries of Caesar}: “Of all the Ethnick Emperors, or great Captaines that euer were, he hath farthest excelled, both in his practice, [of diplomacy] and in his precepts in martiall affaires.”\textsuperscript{55} James also advises, most importantly, his readers that they should not be distracted from the act of ruling. Rule must be something that is not only for show or for study, but action. He quoted the Letter to St. James to remind the reader, “And let not this your knowledge be dead without fruietes, as Saint \textit{James} speaketh of Faith: [James 2: 17] but let it appeare in your daily conuersation, and in all the actions of your life.”\textsuperscript{56} Knowledge must be placed into action for the successful monarch. James also advised his sons that if he should die before Anne, they should honor her. “Honor your mother: set \textit{Beersheba} in a throne on your right hand: offend her for nothing, much lesse wrong her: remember her . . . and that your flesh and blood is made of hers: and beginne not, like the young lorde and lairds, your first warres vpon your Mother; but preasse earnestly to deserue her blessing.”\textsuperscript{57} James seemed earnestly concerned with the notion of a family legacy. Not surprisingly, the upbringing he endured at the hands of unscrupulous Scottish lords denied James any real “family” life.
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Of a Kings Beaviovr in Indifferent Things

The third part of Basilikon Doron continued the theme of “seeing” or “expressing” a king’s virtue.

It is a trew old saying, That a king is as one set on a stage, whose smallest actions and gestures, all the people gazingly doe behold: and therefore although a King be neuer so praecise in the discharging of his Office, the people, who seeth but the outward part, will euer iudge of the substance, by the circumstances; and according to the outward appearance, if his behaviour bee light or dissolute, will conceiue prae-occupieed conceits of the Kings inward intention: which although with time, (the trier of all trewth,) it will euanish, by the evidence of the contrary effects, yet interim partitur iustus; and preaiudge conceits will, in the meane time breed contempt, the mother of rebellion and disorder . . . either vpon vertue or vice, according as they are vsed or ruled: for there is not a middes betwixt them, nor more then betwixt their rewards, heauen and hell.  

James expresses the age-old tension often expressed in “mirror of the prince” literary work of the inward intentions of monarchy being expressed in outward behavior. One’s inner virtue must be reflected in the mirror of public life. Here James emphasized the outward appearance of kingship for this reason, the interior virtuous quality connected with true kingship. Charles I seemed to have taken this outward appearance rather literally. The constructing of image became an obsession by James’s successor. The following chapters show that Charles crafted the exterior fashioning of monarchy along the lines of the courts he visited in Spain and France. He developed his own policy of image making, not through literary works such as the speculum principis tradition exhibited here by his father. Instead, it is through building, sculpture, and painting that Charles would construct his image of kingship, with the exception of the Eikon Basilike, which defended Charles’s kingship and religion at the time of his regicide.

For Charles, art, building and masque was the most efficient way for him to display his inner virtue. It was his outward exposé of his inner. Though this may not have been a central
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theme or the main intention in *Basilikon Doron*, a further important example of a “visual” policy could be implied in the last lines of the *Basilikon Doron*, and “image” is emphasized again in the last pages of the document. James argues for a concept of a visual kingship. “by the outward vsing thereof, to testifie the inward vprightnesse of your heart; and by your behauiour in all indifferent things, to set foorth the viue image of your vertuous disposition; and in respect of the greatnesse and weight of your burthen.”\(^{59}\) Here “outward”, “testify”, “behavior”, “set forth the view-image” “of your virtuous disposition,” seems to have been taken literally when one examines the staggering evidence of material culture that Charles I created from 1625-1642 before he lost control in the Civil War.

This visual theme of the “viue image,” was readily adapted by Charles. The last few lines of *Basilikon Doron* are a poetic reminder to reader that the king must be in charge of all the aspects of government, especially in shaping his image.

> Excudent alij spirantia mollius aera, Credo equidem, & viuos ducent de marmore vultus, Orabunt causas melius, coelique meatus Describent radio, & surgentia sydera dicent. Tu, regere imperio pupuos, Romane, memento (Hae tiie erunt artes) pacique imponere morem ‘Parcere subiectis, & delbellare superbos. \(^{60}\) Taken from Virgil’s *Aeneid*, VI it translates , as Others will more pleasingly beat out the breathing bronze (I do Believe), will draw forth living faces from marble; will better plead cases, will mark the movement of the sky with a rod and proclaim the rising of the stars. You, Roman, be sure to rule peoples by your power (for these will be your arts), to add law to peace, to spare the humble and to subdue the proud. \(^{61}\)

*Basilikon Doron* clearly mirrors the works of *Fürstenspiegel* or *speculum principis* and may have been about very general principles of kingship, however, Charles did guide others to “beat out breathing bronze” and to “draw forth living Marble” in his program for the upgrading
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and renewal of palaces, churches and dynastic art. Even though the general audience was fellow Christians who inhabited the middle ground of Christianity and who rejected Machiavellianism as a way of rule, Charles seems to have read the work much more literally than James may have intended. One so enchanted by the arts, from the time of his youth as Charles, interpreted the vocabulary and advice of the *Basilikon Doron*, to support collection, commissions and implementation of building programs.

As James was master of the literary genre, publishing numerous works from scripture commentary, to poetry, and political works, Charles chose a different artistic path. The charge by his father to “be the master all the arts” would be the most skillful way that this stammering and shy king could show his right to rule. Charles left a record through the employment of bronze makers, painters and master sculptors, and builders. The record is quite clear; Charles I was the greatest “director,” “governor,” or “ruler” of the arts in English history. Even while he attempted the virtuous rule laid out in *Basilikon Doron*, as a divine right monarch, he employed others “to beat out the breathing bronze” and “draw forth faces in marble” and paintings that are still the topic of discussion, argument, and amazement, even if this was not the most literal understanding intended by James I.

**Contemporary Catholic Thought on Absolutism**

One of the important assertions in this study is that early modern England was more influenced by Catholic sources in art and ideology than historians have realized. Catholic sources influenced a drift and a flirtation by James and then by Charles to use material culture as an important tool for the display of absolute monarchy theory. In this “drift,” art and architecture moved toward the more traditional Catholic position and toward display for specific purpose rather than enjoyment. Individuals and ideologies were “tapped” to help shore up and consolidate Stuart rule. This movement toward a Catholic “aesthetic” was conscious and was part of the
Stuarts’s foreign policy, which embraced a notion of a peaceful Europe and a rapprochement with churches, including the largest and most powerful of the day, Catholicism.

One figure who helped straddle the English and Roman communion was Marco Antonio De Dominis. De Dominis is an important example of an exterior influence that had become an interior influence in early Stuart England. He lived and worked in England during this period of “shift” in religious and artistic thought between 1616 and 1624. This era marks the advancement of high-church Arminians and anti-Calvinists to power within the English Church and a shift in decoration and building that echoed what was happening in Catholic Europe. De Dominis was one of the most ardent proponents of the Designation Theory of Absolutism, a theory of Absolutism, which taught that the monarch—or bishop—one placed in power could not be removed. He immigrated to England in the middle of the second decade of the seventeenth-century.

An Italian theologian and natural philosopher from Venice, De Dominis was educated by the Jesuits at Loreto and Padua and might have joined their order in 1579.62 It is interesting to note that Venice had been one of the major areas where the anti-Machiavellian theory had developed. Historians often try to paint the Catholicism of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-centuries as monolithic. It appears that there was considerable fluidity and variation of thought on papal authority and a need for continued reformation of church culture, especially its involvement in the political sphere. Here the viewpoint of Venice was often similar to James’s views about papal supremacy while still maintaining its ties within the greater Catholic unity.

Venice also clearly had economic and political reasons to side with England. (It is of interest to note that Venetian works of art were the most sought after by Charles.)

De Dominis taught in Verona as a professor of rhetoric, mathematics, and philosophy. He became archbishop in Seni in Dalmatia (still controlled by Venice at the time), and was an avid reformer, bringing him into conflict with his suffragan bishops and through them, the papacy. When petitioned by the people of his metropolitan see, the papal courts took the side of the plaintiffs. This was the beginning of the quarrels De Dominis had with the papal court, recounted in his work titled *Concilliam profectionis*. He explained in his biography that this negative experience then led him to a deeper study of ecclesiastical law, church history, and dogmatic theology, leading him into a love of the “true” Catholic Church. In this work, he also condemned the “meddling” of the papacy in local church affairs. He was not successful in pressing Rome for a more sympathetic ear for reform, so he resigned his diocese, returned to Venice, and wrote the account of his problems with the Vatican in September 1616.

De Dominis owed his religious, artistic, and political views to his country. Venice was fiercely independent, and yet fiercely Catholic. During the early part of the seventeenth-century, Venice managed to stand up not only to Pope Paul V and his political allies, but also to the Turks. Paolo Sarpi, a friar and chronicler of this period, records the importance of England’s help in these politically difficult times for Venice. As with other Catholic countries of the time, Venice sought to regulate the church within its borders and manage its own affairs while still being in union with the greater church. De Dominis supported Venice in its struggle with the papacy. He experienced first-hand the way Venice conducted its relationships between temporal
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and ecclesiastical personalities. This was a pattern to reform and reunify the international Church, which could also possibly create unification with like-minded Protestants. In many ways this was the “mission” he had in mind for his journey to England.

De Dominis left Italy by way of Switzerland and the Low Countries, where his journey led him to the court of James I in London. He arrived in December 1616 and was welcomed by the king and the English clergy with great respect. According to the writings of Arthur Wilson in *The History of Grate Britain*, De Dominis was “old and corpulent, unfit for travel, being almost at his journey’s end by Nature: yet he began to speak out somewhat vigorously against the faith and the practice of the Church of Rome almost immediately after his arrival to England.” This clearly endeared him to the court, as most of his rhetoric was about the political nature of the Roman Church. He joined the Church of England in St. Paul’s Cathedral and was appointed master of the Savoy in 1618. In 1619, he became dean of Windsor. Contemporary English writers do not give a sympathetic account of him, describing him as pretentious, avaricious and fat, however his ability was undoubted and in the theological controversies of his time he soon accepted a celebrated role in England as a “trophy convert” as a former Catholic Archbishop. His most important work in England was a description of how the church should be governed: *De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ contra Primatum Papae*. This work was published under royal patronage in London in 1617. While there, he published attacks on the papacy, including *Papatus Romanus*, issued anonymously in London in 1617, and *Scogli del naufragio Christiano*, which
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64 William B. Patterson, 223.

was preached before the king and published in 1618. It was translated into English, French, and German.

His principle theory, on which rested his entire system, was the insistence on the divine prerogatives of the Catholic episcopates against the encroachments of papal monarchy. Each bishop was equal and self-governing, and he received his status in church independently from the papacy and from God through ordination. This idea of “ordination” was also central in his notion of absolute monarchy, which he championed in England as well. De Dominis was no Calvinist. Anthony Milton, one of the first to identify De Dominis as an important influence in English thought in the second decade of the 1600s wrote:

Essentially, Laudians felt particular animus against Calvin and Calvinist doctrine because of the de facto authority that they had established in the Elizabethan and Jacobean Church. Richard Montague’s *New Gag* was composed explicitly in order to achieve what Carrier and Archbishop De Dominis had earlier craved: the removal of Calvinist doctrines from the Church of England’s formal polemic by means of a rigid distinction between the church’s public resolutions and the private opinions of her members.⁶⁶

According to Milton, De Dominis was one of the important sources of thought, which was essentially Catholic, for those later called “Laudians.”

Though De Dominis returned to Rome hoping to reconcile with the newly elected Pope Gregory XV, who also happened to be a relative of his, his most important contribution in England was his constant support of the notion of the divine right of kings and bishops and his hope for reunion between the English and Roman churches. De Dominis provided a vital connection to the theory of the other anti-Machiavellians who based their theory of rule on natural law and the microcosm’s reflection of the macrocosm. He was also a great supporter of religious and secular art.

Another important Catholic (and at times Protestant) philosopher, who had wide notoriety and influence, was Justus Lipsius. Lipsius is considered one of the most important anti-Machiavellians and was equally revered in his day by Protestants and Catholics. His reputation at the time was as legendary as that of his fellow compatriot and humanist scholar a century earlier, Erasmus. Lipsius is of interest in this study because of his many published works on absolutism. But even more importantly, Lipsius had a close relationship with Peter Paul Rubens. Rubens painted the most important statement about kingship in early modern England, the Banqueting House ceiling (Figures 4-1, 4-2, 4-3). Similar to most of the scholars connected with anti-Machiavellianism, Lipsius was internationally recognized, and had a vast and very public correspondence with many of the leading figures of Europe.

As with Erasmus, Lipsius sought to reconcile Christianity with the classical tradition in a synthesis that would be useful to his contemporaries. Lipsius was a staunch advocate of peace and reconciliation--politically as well as spiritually--between the churches.67 His writings, such as Two Books on Constancy (1584) and Political Advice and Examples (1605), both advocated a “strong and unified state as the way out of the civil and religious chaos he saw engulfing himself and his world.”68 More on Lipsius will be integrated in subsequent chapters in relation to art.

Anti-Machiavellians, such as De Dominis and Lipsius, occupied a spectrum in the Catholic Church that did not believe that the papacy had any direct power or divine mandate to interfere in sovereign European states. This too was an important link to the political reasoning of the Stuarts. As with James, these theologians and philosophers were willing to be more
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“flexible” on doctrines in the church if the papacy would acknowledge the rights of a sovereign
to political leadership that included a more direct control of the church within an independent
country’s boundaries. This very theme was taken up in “negotiations” by bishop Montague
during the 1630s. Montague claimed that moderate Caroline bishops were interested in a
Galician-inspired reunion scheme, which would have been a semi-autonomous English Catholic
Church, as had been created repeatedly in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-centuries in
the Eastern Uniate Rites, Rites that were semi-autonomous but still in union with Rome. Milton
wrote that moderation by most bishops, except Hall, Morton, and Davenport, established a
climate of opinion in which Montague’s plans could develop, with a latitude of belief regarding
relations between churches. Montague and others hoped that:

The churches . . . could comprehend reunion schemes with little sense of strain. De Dominis’ 7000 men [De Dominis had claimed that there were that many active churchmen who were friendly with the thought of reunion in England] could at last lift up their heads. the Roman and Protestant church were a good deal closer to each other in their doctrine than the polarized forms of religious controversy would suggest. The Doctrine of the Two Churches, the Papal Antichrist, the depiction of popery as false religion—all these arguments sought to create an absolute doctrinal division which would correspond to the physical and political separation of the churches. By rejecting these polemical forms, the Laudians could not help but bring the Roman and English Churches closer together.\(^{69}\)

Along with a respect for power, the anti-Machiavellians, as well as some of the Jacobean and
Caroline bishops who worked toward a unified Christianity, were examples of “fluidity” in
religious allegiance and thought in the early modern period.

At the center of their writings, the anti-Machiavellians fostered the notion of unity
between Catholics and other Christian churches as an important characteristic of statecraft.\(^{70}\)

Détente was also a chief goal for James, according to recent research by W. B. Patterson.
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Patterson demonstrates that James’s call for unification of the Christian church was indeed sincere. James’s diplomacy sought the unification of the church with the exception of the extreme Jesuits and Puritans. His plan for dynastic marriages clearly seems to be a bridging element in this policy of rapprochement and reconciliation.\textsuperscript{71}

One of the important lines of thinking that connected James and the anti-Machiavellians was the notion of civility toward other Christians who were not of the same creed. The Stuarts and anti-Machiavellian Catholics accepted the contemporary consensus that unity of religion was extremely desirable as a bond helping to unite citizens to a state. They granted that heresy should be rooted out if possible, but they also realized that “toleration” was useful in that further religious strife only led to a barbarization of people. In the end, it undermined all religion and destroyed the state if one side could not totally win. Therefore, a limited toleration was an acceptable policy.

James and Charles also evidenced proto-tolerance in their consistent “softness” on the Catholic contingent at court, made necessary because of Catholic spouses, the growing international nature of court figures in early modern England, and the sincere desire for church unity. James had always been able to distinguish between Catholics who were loyal and those who were seditious. Those who were loyal were left on their own to practice a discreet Catholicism. Throughout their reigns, James and Charles were consistently attacked in the English press for their toleration of popery. This “softness” toward moderate Catholics also allowed the free flow of Catholic ideas and art and must be recognized as important.

The reaction to this “toleration” was significant. Almost yearly, some author warned about the king’s imminent conversion. Note that one of the most inaccurate accusations by
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parliamentarians was that Charles proved his “popery” by his toleration of many Catholics in the nobility and the pampering of Henrietta Maria. In many ways, the policies of James and Charles reflected a growing notion in Europe of the futility of religious war, repressions, especially while working for some kind of middle ground and organic unity, as James did earnestly, and Charles did tacitly. If Catholics did not plot against the crown, they could worship discreetly (as did Queen Anne), as long as they did not make great efforts at conversions outside their numbers. Both Charles and James made limited accommodations for Catholic and Protestant dissenters, as long as they did not interfere with the king’s right to rule or try to destabilize the peace of the country or the peace of the church. This point of view by the Stuarts was rather enlightened, considering Catholic and Protestant countries on the continent often treated non-conformists with barbarism.

**Foreign Policy: The Marriage Plans for Prince Henry**

Before and after the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War, at the center of James’s foreign policy was a rapprochement with the rest of Christendom. A crucial part of this policy was his obsession with a Catholic match for his oldest son Henry (and then for Charles after Henry’s death). James had already succeeded in re-creating the legendary “Ancient Empire of Great Britain,” made peace with Spain, and by 1609 had halted the long struggle in the Netherlands with the Twelve Years’ Truce. Others, too, such as Campanella, thought that radical Catholics and radical Protestants could be held at bay. Many moderate thinkers, attempting to repair the shattered *res publica litterarum*, had almost messianic hopes that were focused on moderate rulers like Henri IV in France and James I in England.

The marriage policy of James should be placed within this understanding of greater hope for European détente, if not a religious reunion. Dynastic marriage between partners of different faiths was one aspect of attempts to achieve a de facto *via media* before the holocaust of the
Thirty Years’ War, and James I was the prime exponent of this pattern of thought. His insistence on “marriage of his two oldest children to a Catholic and a Protestant remained constant. In this way he [James] saw the Ecclesia Anglicana, being both Catholic and reformed, as a bridgehead to theological reconciliation.” Many historians ignore the fact that the first attempt by James and Anne was not the Spanish Match, but a match to an important Italian princess. Prince Henry was always a peripheral figure in this affair, as he was a minor during all the negotiations with Italians. Though at times evidence shows that he protested a Catholic match, Henry was deeply enthralled by Italian culture. As a youth, he collected books, pictures, bronzes, and antique gems and medals, and commissioned a vast palace in classical style and a garden project, patronizing artists as varied as Inigo Jones, Robert Peake, Mierevelt, and Constantino de’Servi.

His biographers noted that Henry had an aversion to marrying a Catholic. But as a loyal son, he was willing or at least resigned to meet his father’s demands. The most promising match seemed to be with the duchy of Florence. Grand Duchess Christina sent her confessor to Rome to obtain papal assent. Queen Anne of Denmark, along with the Catholic lords, supported the match. In a letter from Anne of Denmark to the pope, she admitted her Catholicism again and signed “humilissima et diligentissima figliuola et serva.” She optimistically stated that the marriage could be a means to convert her son.

After marriage negotiations failed for a princess from the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, James and his agents looked to the House of Savoy to one of the daughters of Charles Emmanuel. As
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73 Roy Strong, 76.

74 Roy Strong, 84. Strong quoted a letter found in ASF Miscellanea Medicea 293, inserto 29, no. 2 about the queen’s support of the Tuscan match and her Catholicism.
with the negotiations with the Medici, complications arose for this marriage, but according to the
research of Roy Strong, the marriage would certainly have taken place if Henry had not died
before the dowry was sent. Though Henry would have objected to a Catholic bride, according to
the documented negotiations, the restrictions on a princess--when it came to practicing and
displaying her Catholic faith--would have been minimal on a Venetian, a Medici or a Savoy.\textsuperscript{75} A
much greater Catholic presence would have occurred more than a decade earlier in English court
if the young prince had not died of typhoid at the age of eighteen. What these wedding
negotiations certainly accomplished was to influence considerably English tastes toward
southern European ideas about art and religion in the Jacobean period. Almost all scholars of the
period note a substantial relaxation of Catholic persecution and enforcement of recusant laws
during this period due to the possibility of a Catholic bride.

\textbf{James, Classicism and Protestant Reaction: Classicism and Catholicism}

In \textit{Basilikon Doron}, many examples occur of James looking back toward the Roman past
for inspiration and for emulation or as sources of ironic arguments. More than twenty references
to Caesar, to Romans, to imperial virtue, or to imperial greatness are found in this document.

Historians do not usually give much attention to religious affiliations regarding English
classicism. As with most religious opinion in early modern England, certain camps embraced
this continental influence while other camps derided it. The usual neutral summation of classical
influence is summed up in the thoughts of one of the founders of the study of classicism in early
modern England, John Ruskin. He argued that classicism was a bookish affair that was slowly
introduced into the English mix through education, travel, and exposure to the collections of the

\footnote{Roy Strong, 88-97. Strong documented the negotiations that occurred between 1610
and 1612 and concluded that the marriage would have been a reality barring some tragedy, such
as the young prince’s demise.}
continent. In this view of classicism, English attitude slowly turned away from the Gothic through the importation of foreign artisans due to the aesthetics of the court and of important English collectors. This assumption seems to reflect a rather seamless and trouble-free acceptance of classicism in early modern England. Many authors have followed Ruskin’s line of thinking that the decline of the Gothic had nothing to do with the Reformation76 or that the imposition of classical ideals by the early Stuarts was related to their theory of government. However, evidence can be given to the contrary that the Stuarts’ adoption of “artistic vision” similar to southern European monarchs may have also seen the introduction of classicism as a religious statement.

In general, the Puritans and stricter Calvinists’ reactions against ancient paganism were predictable with their claims of “false gods” and idols, which were toppled by early Christianity and re-embraced by the “Whore of Babylon”--the Roman Church. A negative reaction also occurred among like-minded English Protestants to the introduction of classicism as an architectural style that reflected a return to antique paganism, even if it could be justified on aesthetic grounds. After all, had not the papacy led the fifteenth and sixteenth-centuries in the collection and emulation of the classic works of art, in the rebuilding of Rome in the classical style, and in the collection of antique art with their sculptural galleries at the Vatican and personal villas.77 “Popery” would not be a positive model for many Protestants who followed Calvinist thought about art and Calvin’s visceral distrust of religious sculpture. Many of the


77 Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981), Chapter 2. These authors argued in this chapter for a more religious interpretation to be attached to classicism and a closer connection to the Catholic south.
Puritan clergy and their supporters would have gleefully destroyed all representations of classical paganism to protect their “godly” flocks from idolatry.

English collectors defended and emulated the classical statues and buildings of the Roman heritage. Most of these collectors were Catholic or Catholic sympathizers, such as the Howards or Inigo Jones. The greatest of these collectors was Lord Arundel, who started and maintained a spectacular collection when he was still Catholic. They positively embraced the classical. Just as it had been in antiquity, the model of perfection of Renaissance and Baroque architecture embraced the proportions of the human figure as the harmonious and proportionate mathematical perfection. This theory about the body was legitimized by Catholic theoreticians. It became the basis for the use of classical forms in a Christian context, which endowed it with a new spiritual meaning.78 With classicism’s association with the Catholic south, it is hardly a surprise that some in Protestant England should also have a less than favorable view of classical art and architecture.

Numerous monuments survived in southern Europe that had been “baptized” and used by Christianity. Many temples were converted into churches, such as the Temple of Castor and Pollux in Naples (A-53, A-54), which was studied and drawn by Jones, and several temples in Rome including the Pantheon (Figure 4-1) and Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Assisi (Figure 4-2); two temples had been converted into churches in the Roman forum. Unsurprisingly, timidity existed in accepting classicism as a model for church and state buildings. The history of England

was far removed from the antiquity of the south, and it had long forgotten the connection with the history, art, and building of Roman Britannia.

Another example of distrust of classicism was that during the implementation of Protestantism in England, reformers were quick to point out that one of the errors of medieval Catholicism had been its compromise with the pagan past. This was seen, according to the reformers, in the continuity of pagan sacred rites, in the ingredients of the sacramental life heretically “created” by the medieval church, and particularly in, the love of art expressed in churches throughout England during the Middle Ages. This attitude was alive well into the seventeenth-century. A member of Parliament informed the Long Parliament in 1641 (Charles I convened this parliament after the Bishops’ War to pay for that war), “The picture of our Savior . . . in ancient tyme was the picture of Apollo . . . if a heathen should come into the church and see this picture; he might conceive that we are turned heathens.”

Ironically, the culture of England’s Reformation was dependent somewhat on the legacy of Greece and Rome. While criticizing pagan culture, Reformed Protestants such as Calvin admitted that medicine, mathematics, philosophy, and the burgeoning science of antiquity were God-given achievements of the human spirit. These sciences and art all had their roots in antiquity. However, an anti-classical undercurrent dated to the Elizabethan period. Authors such as Richard Lynche wrote in *The Fountaine of ancient Fiction* that the antiquity of Greece and Rome was primarily a time of superstition, blindness and spiritual bankruptcy. Another author, Stephan Batman, wrote in 1577:
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We Christians, now lyuinge in the cleare light of the Gospels may euidently see with what erroneous trumperies, Antiquitie hath bene nozzled: in what foggy mystes they have long wandered: in what filthye puddles they have bene myered: under what masking visors of clouted religions they have bene bewitched: what traditions they have of theyr owne phantstical braynes to themselves forged: & finallye into what Apostacye, Atheisme, Blasphemy, Idolatrye, and Heresie they have plunged their soules.81

Opposition arose to the foreign and “misguided” classical culture by some of the more Reformed Protestants. This rejection of the Greek and Roman antiquity (and southern European Catholicism by association) was reflected in the works of George Hakewill. In his Apologie (third edition published in 1635), Hakewill listed cruelty, covetousness, robbery, sacrilege, and gluttony as “Roman” attributes. Even education was under assault when it failed to distance the newly “purified” Protestant religion from the “heresy” of the past. From the beginning of the Reformation in England, a constant pressure arose from Protestants to purge the curriculum of its more offensively pagan aspects. The Puritan, Thomas Becon, railed against “schools wherein nothing is taught but the doctrine of paganism.”82 Others lamented at filling schoolboys’ heads with what William Harrison called “vain fables of the false goddess and unchristian education.” Even a hatred for the language of the Romans, Latin, was reflected in many of the secretarial writings of the Interregnum (1649-1660). Some of the secretaries considered Latin the language of the beast.83

The reaction against the classicism or against neo-classical Baroque culture was reflected


in writings that criticized the collection of these artifacts because of their nudity and the possibility of idolatry. Sir Henry Wotton, a lover of architecture, cautioned readers in his book titled *The Elements of Architecture* to be careful of the lure of art.\(^8^4\) The antiquarian Randle Holme III considered that it was the return of classical, nude figures on church tombs and monuments that was the main catalyst that provoked much of the iconoclasm of the Civil War.\(^8^5\)

One of the continual criticisms of a classical style was that it was a foreign style and it was being forced on the people of London through proclamations regulating buildings in London. William Harrison lamented that there were so many foreign craftsmen doing works in England that were no more talented than the English craftsmen and that Vitruvius and his ilk were no better designers than the English.\(^8^6\) Other designers also did not welcome the Italian influence. Thomas Fuller noted that most Italians regarded the buildings of Britain as coarse and Gothic. He answered this criticism with one of his own. Even though the Italians had advantages with fine material like porphyry and marble, they could learn a thing or two from the English designs, “our [Gothic] churches especially.”\(^8^7\)

The Arminians and anti-Calvinists in particular clung to the notion of sacred space and the medieval Catholic inheritance in church design. In general, they did not oppose the


\(^{8^5}\) Randle Holme, *The academy of armory, or, A storehouse of armory and blazon containing the several variety of created beings, and how born in coats of arms, both foreign. . . .*, 1688, ed., I. H. Jeayes (Roxburghe Club, 1905), vol. 2, 521-522. According to the research of Keith Thomas, Holme was plagiarizing the work *Acient Funerall Monuments . . .*, page 11, by John Weever who described much of the artwork done as funeral monuments.


“classicizing” construction of the Stuarts, who would take the country and church toward classicism in imperial building and church architecture. The Arminians and anti-Calvinists may have been elevated as much for their “taste” as for their theology. Their tastes reflected the preferences of the early Stuart monarchy. Laud, Andrewes, Wren, and others who are identified as “Anglicans” “anti-Calvinists” or “Arminians,” were supporters of the renewal and redecoration of the churches in this new style, and the especially supported the new façade of St. Paul’s.

An Imperial City for England

The Stuarts left the mark of classicism on London, which was initiated in the middle of reign of James I.

A constant feature of the reign of James [was a] serious, sustained and partially successful attempt to raise the standards of hygiene and building in London through a series of Royal Proclamations; an impetus given an extra thrust with the creation of the Jacobean Commission for new building in 1618, which soon established itself as an important instrument of social control under the effective dominance of Inigo Jones.88

The classical ideal of the imperial city was expressed in building projects reflected in those Royal Proclamations and new architecture and church building. James wanted London to reflect the magnificence of the Catholic capital cities of southern Europe. These imperial cities tried to impose a classical structure on the city streets and on the civil buildings and residences. The idea of London as an “Imperial City” was a way of continuing his own self-fashioning. “James I believed that London had to be clean, hygienic, fire-resistant, rich and splendid, as a whole series of his proclamations makes abundantly clear.”89 The virtue of the monarch was expressed in the
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89 David Howarth, 28.
control of the visual stimulation of the citizens in great classical vistas and modern “forums”
created in the great cities of the south. This was reflected in one of the portraits of James, who
prominently (and fictitiously) placed the Banqueting House outside of his apartments at
Whitehall (A-55). Classical architecture and harmonious piazzas, which did not exist in London
at the time, were prominently displayed in the portrait of Charles I as Prince of Wales (A-56).
The emulation of these great cities was expressed by Jones, the king’s master of works, who
criticized the Gothic, as well as the mannerist elements of his day, in favor of what he personally
experienced during his years in Italy.

And to saie trew all thes composed ornaments the wch Proceed out of ye aboundance of
designers and wear brought in by Michill Angell and his followers in my oppignion do not
well in solid Architecture and ye fasciati of houses, but in gardens loggis stucco or
ornaments of chimnies pecces or in the inner parts of houses thos compositions are of
necessity to be yoused. For as outwardly every wyse man carrieth a gravity in Publicke
Places, whear there is nothing els looked for, yet inwardly hath his immaginacy set on fire,
and sumtimes licenciously flying out, as nature hir sealf doeth often tymes stravagantly, to
delight, amase us sumtimes moufe us to laughter, sometime to contemplation and horror,
so in architecture ye outward ornaments oft [ought] to be solid, proporsionable according
to the rules, masculine and unaffected.90

Architectural historian James Lubbock wrote that Jones “perceived himself not as the man
who merely restored to Britain a classical architecture, but as the man who restored it in its truest
and purest Roman form, purged of all the licentious ornament of Michelangelo and his Mannerist
followers.”91 But Jones had already seen temples converted to churches with strictly classical
portals and pediments in Rome and Naples. Jones applied such classical values to the context of
public buildings in London. For Jones and James I, architecture theory had its roots in

90 James Lubbock, The Tyranny of Taste: The Politics of Architecture and Design in

91 James Lubbock, 164.
paternalistic and masculine attitudes. Jones’s above quotation is filled with words like “gravity,” “wisdom,” “rules,” “masculinity,” “straightforwardness,” and “solidly.” James and Jones envisioned a moral code for the living brick and mortar of the city.

However, England was clearly far behind its southern contemporaries. James was the first English monarch to try to implement some type of public uniformity in London. The great palace complex at Whitehall was almost 100 years old and warren-like in comparison to the classically-inspired palaces already built or being built in Italy, Spain, France, and The Empire. It has been argued that James I had no interest in art or architecture, but that seems to be unfair and inaccurate. Though he did not write any treatise or leave for posterity a particular view of art, he did leave examples of wide-ranging proclamations about what was desirable in architecture. Those proclamations often drew a parallel between James and the Emperor Augustus. The Latin inscription for the Banqueting House, which replaced the first Jacobean Banquet House, destroyed in the fire of 1619 reads:

The genius of the place, the observer-guest.  
This [building], which strikes the eye by its majesty and Speaks most magnificently of the soul of its Lord,  
Razed when scarcely previously made of brick, but now the Equal of any marble buildings throughout Europe,  
JAMES, first monarch of Great Britain, built up from the Ground; intended for festive occasions, for formal spectacles, And for the ceremonials Of the British court; to the eternal glory of his/its name and Of his/its most peaceful empire, he left it for posterity.  
In the year 1621.92

This marker certainly was advertisement enough to suggest the first monarch of Great Britain had plans for London. London was still in many ways a medieval town with narrow streets and mostly wood buildings. It had no real plan or vision that would distinguish it as an
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92 Dedication stone of the Banqueting House.
“imperial” city, as was the claim that the Stuarts initiated upon their ascension to power. One way to remedy this was to make plans during the Jacobean period for bringing some type of uniformity of street architecture. This uniformity was called for in James’s proclamations regulating the buildings of London, which required a “uniformed order and frame” in the street fronts of houses. Some of his subjects did not welcome this attempt at uniformity. “A classical uniformity” was challenged in James’s last Parliament, and the House of Commons of 1624 saw it as “a great grievance to the freedom and state of the subjects.” Their vision was limited to their own personal costs.

A New Vision: Implemented and Planned Works 1619-1624

Building is not the only important way that the early Stuarts were planning to express their right to rule as God’s lieutenants. “Building, painting, but also sculpture and tapestry, all were part of the repertoire of regal advertisements during the earliest years of the Stuart dynasty.” David Howarth has suggested that James often looked to “France when he wanted to take social or economic initiatives, and to judge from a scheme to erect statues of himself and the Prince of Wales in London. It would seem that he had taken notice of the admiration of the equestrian, life-sized bronze statue of Henri IV cast by Pietro Tacda, and set up on the Pont Neuf in Paris, following the assassination of Henri in 1610.” With James’s approval, Parliament
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planned to erect statues in 1621 in honor of the Prince of Wales and James. With James using Arundel to further the project, the House of Lords initiated the proposal and plans for the sculptures. These plans went as far as debating the feasibility of creating each “statue of Brasse . . . to the Kyng and prynce out of a general contribution by us [the House of Lords] . . . to be ericited here in the parliament house.” Lord Arundel, as a well-known connoisseur who had extensive artistic contacts in Europe, was to “wryte beyonde seas for thess statua to be sett on worke.”97

One consideration that hampered Stuart plans for artwork and building was their relative poverty compared to southern European monarchs. As with Parliament’s bronze statues, a list of planned works never came to fruition, such as tombs for Prince Henry and Queen Anne. James had spent 3,500 pounds for four monuments, which included tombs for his mother, Queen Elizabeth and two infant daughters, Sophia, and Mary.98 Henry’s tomb was not finished because the marriage of the princess Elizabeth to the Elector cost an astonishing 13,000 pounds, “an expense which crippled the royal finances for years afterwards.”99 Unfortunately, the death of Queen Anne also “coincided with a financial crisis . . . her funeral was delayed for over two


98 Francis Helen Relf, 48.
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months because of the shortage of money.”100 Two magnificent Stuart tombs would have been constructed if England had a less-antiquated way of financing government.

The idea of imperial image also came through exposure to outside forces in theory. One of the most important influences that allowed classicism to gain footing with the Stuart monarchs was the writing of Juan Bautista Villalpando (whose book Charles continued to study even up to the eve of his execution). Villalpando wrote that Solomon was the “font” of classical ideals and that the Temple of Solomon was a Vitruvian building. The connection to a Solomonic age was an important element in the Stuart tradition regarding absolutism. James, as the “second Solomon,” was sympathetic to Villalpando’s arguments.

Villalpando argued that the five orders of classical architecture stemmed from Solomon’s building. Wittkower wrote that the notion of Villalpando’s connection of Solomon to the Catholic Renaissance was an extremely important fact that most historians and art historians have overlooked. This union of classical with Old Testament kingship by Villalpando was “a religious vindication of neo-classicism of which we have completely lost sight.”101 The religious nature of neoclassicism and its identity with Spanish Catholic proponents about the religious nature of this “style” may have been an important influence in the decisions of James and Charles. The first Stuart endeavors in classicism came during the period when Spain was considered a potentially important ally, 1612 to 1624. This experience of art was especially important, as Charles had first-hand experience in Spain, which was the result of Villalpando’s

ideology made into stone. The fact that this style began to be identified with Catholic absolutism may also have been a major contributor to the “rejection” of classicism by some of the “godly.”

**Classicism in the Royal Chapel and Church During the Reign of James I**

James was the first English monarch to embrace classical architecture by his commissioning of the Banqueting House (Figure 4-3). The importance of this building can be illustrated in several paintings showing him proudly standing in a window before the great hall, as Caesar would stand in front of his forum (A-55). James, Jones, and Charles in many ways started a tradition in England and a belief in the importance of architecture as a statement of faith (as in Wren’s St. Paul’s) or good government that would be embraced later in the century. Sir Roger Pratt, influenced by the Stuart legacy, noted: “the example of all good Architecture was originally taken from the Temple of Solomon, and from the Jews communicated to the Grecian, from thence to the Romans, and from them to their Provincials.”

Classical architecture could make a religious statement as well as a political one, most evident in the rebirth of Wren’s St. Paul’s at the end of the seventeenth-century.

The notion of classical architecture and its connection with religion in early modern England was the imitation of contemporary Catholic art in the royal chapels. In the Chapel Royal, refurbished toward the end of James’s reign, the architecture emphasized an “imperial power” over the church in a west end with new additions of classical architecture. The west works were decorated with massive wooden structures that framed a new closet window with five large columns on pedestals. The closet was constructed to imitate marble, and these
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103 Unfortunately, these chapels have been remodeled, but it is important not to discount the contemporary descriptions of these important and imitated places of worship.
columns were decorated with clusters of hanging fruit over which were placed the prince and the
king’s coat of arms. These were “borne by two boyes [cherubs] with two victories on each side
of them.”

This chapel at Greenwich seems to have echoed the façade of the Banqueting
House. It was painted white with gold window casements and was a classical, sculptural
treatment. This classicism was unprecedented in any of the previously created royal chapels.

Classicism was definitely foreign in the churches and palaces of London until James.
Church building and decoration in the Jacobean period has not been thoroughly studied.
However, a text that helps to illuminate the times is *The survey of London*, which described the
renovations of English Churches during the latter part of Elizabeth’s reign and the entire reign of
James. It gives context to the decorative schemes of English Churches before the Arminian
Counter-Reformation. Munday and Dyson enlarged *The survey of London* in 1633, giving more
information about church repairs and decoration in the London area. The text was a parish-by-
parish description of the repair and decoration of churches dating from 1603 to 1633. It gave
evidence that is often overlooked by historians who have followed earlier assumptions that little
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106 John Stow, Anthony Munday and others. *The survey of London containing the
originall, increase, moderne estate, and government of that city....* (London: Printed by Elizabeth
Purslovv, by Nicholas Bourne, at his shop at the south entrance of the Royall Exchange, 1633).
The work for which Stow was best known is his *Survey of London*, published in 1598, not only
interesting from the quaint simplicty of its style and its amusing descriptions and anecdotes, but
of unique value from its minute account of the buildings, social conditions, and customs of
London in the time of Elizabeth I. A second edition appeared in his lifetime in 1603, a third with
additions by Anthony Munday in 1618, a fourth by Munday and Dyson in 1633. This fourth
dition is the one that is pertinent to this study as it records when and where decorations and
additions to the churches of the London area were completed. Especially helpful to this
discussion are pages 800-886.
church repair or decoration was accomplished during the late Elizabethan period or during the
time of James I.

Most of the Elizabethan period testifies to a lack of concern for the churches of London or
royal chapels. It has been assumed that after the seizure of the monastic properties sufficient
numbers of churches existed in the capital for most of Elizabeth’s reign, therefore no real need
was in place to build or expand churches. Economic historians, however, paint a picture of an
ever-expanding and vibrant capital at the beginning of the 1590s, and show continued growth of
the city and economy in the early seventeenth-century due in part to the pacific policies of James
I. This then explains the descriptions in The survey of London of much-needed expansion of
existing parishes and “beatifications” of these edifices.

The survey of London was dedicated to the Puritan Bishop, John King, bishop of London
from 1611 to 1621. King was interested in the documentation of church repairs and rebuilding.
This new edition of the work seems to be in response to the Roman Catholic polemic that
Protestantism led to the neglect of charity and good works, as exemplified by the dilapidated
state of churches by the end of Elizabeth’s reign. These same concerns led Andrew Willet, one of
the most popular anti-papal writers of the period, to compile a catalogue of the many forms of
philanthropic donations since the time of the Reformation.107

Munday’s text, showed what was being created and the “tastes” of the Londoners during
this period. The text also showed how most of the London area churches dramatically differed in
aesthetics from the undertakings of James in his own private chapels and the ecclesial works and

107 Andrew Willet, Synopsis papismi, that is, A generall vievv of papistrie vvhереin the
whole mysterie of iniquitie, and summe of antichristian doctrine is set downe… (London:
Imprinted by Felix Kyngston, for Thomas Man, dwelling in Pater noster row at the signe of the
Talbot, 1600). Willet discusses the additions and the cost of repairs and decorations of churches
on pages 1219 to 1243 in defense of Catholic accusations of letting church buildings decay.
commissions undertaken by the royal family during the time of Charles I. According to the work of J. F. Merritt, who has compared *The survey of London* with other manuscripts and printed sources, it is possible to determine that it was not exaggerated and was in most cases accurate when depicting the building construction, design, and artworks completed in this period.\(^{108}\)

Another reason to trust the accuracy of such polemical works as *The survey of London* was the fact that exchanges between Roman Catholic and Protestant adherents were often factually based. Often for no less an important reason than inaccuracy would lead to easy “point-scoring” by one’s enemies. The accuracy of the descriptions in this text could have been easily “checked out” by simply visiting the churches.

The pre-Laudian “revival” of church decoration and repair in London is important to this study in that it differs strikingly and gives the historian a view of what was acceptable art and architecture. It offers the vantage point of the ordinary parishioners and the local mostly-Puritan clergy and Bishops before the movement toward anti-Calvinism. It is not surprising then that no reference exists to new sculptures or religious paintings in Munday’s work in most churches until the latter part of James’s reign. Munday’s descriptions usually included creation of scripture texts, painted glass (decorative or plain colored glass, not depictions of saints or scriptural stories told in glass), coats of arms, or refurbishment of furnishings. Nothing suggested any significant movement by the majority Puritan or Calvinist clergy or parishes toward anything that would be described as Counter-Reformation Catholic Baroque decoration or classicism. On the contrary, the polemic and tone of much of Protestant writing during this period reflected a preoccupation

with physical church edifices and a belief that they had become emblematic of the chief sins of
the Roman Church--the pre-Reformation doctrine of works and idolatry.  

Andrew Willet, the noted moderate Puritan divine, promoted modest reconditioning of
London parishes as long as they did not become overly ornate or idolatrous. Churches “ought to
goe comely and decently appareled . . . not tricked up with the jewels and ornaments of an
harlot.”  

John Brinsley also emphasized that nothing was wrong with proper decoration, which
is decoration in the Puritan plain tradition. “The decent beautifying of the places of God’s
publique worship rather for the eye [the idolatry of Catholicism], eare . . . indeed all their service
is but eye-service.”  

Plainness was the rule for the godly.

Decorations that furthered the Protestant cause, however, were being sponsored
throughout the city. Among the most common decorations found in London before the Arminian
Counter-Reformation were memorials dedicated to Queen Elizabeth I. These memorials were
painted or wood reliefs that were monuments to the Queen, who became even more popular after
her death than during her life. A mythology developed during this period in which Elizabeth was
viewed as a grand champion of the Protestant cause. One can see this in Robert Stephenson’s
Allegory of the Defeat of the Armada, dated to 1610 (A-57). This work shows the armada in the
shape of a dragon, defeated by God’s mysterious plan. Elizabeth is God’s real champion.

109 On polemics of an anti-decorative Puritan mindset, see Margaret Aston’s England’s
Iconoclasts (Oxford, 1988) and Anthony Milton’s Catholic and Reformed (Cambridge, 1995),
187-90.

110 Andrew Willet, 486.

111 John Brinsley, Glorie of the latter temple greater than of the former. Opened in a
sermon preached at the consecration or restitution of the Parish Church of Flixton in the island
of Lounigland in the county of Suffolke; being sometimes the mother church of the East-Angles.
11. March. 1630 (London: Printed by G. Miller for Robert Bird, and are to be sold at his shop at
the signe of the Bible in Saint Laurence-lane, 1631), 17-18.
Another such work that was dated long after her death is the engraving, *Queen Elizabeth as St. George* (A-58). Here she slays a seven-headed dragon (reminiscent of the Seven Hills of Rome) to free an allegorical faith figure from a cave.

Works such as these were dedicated to Elizabeth as if she were the last true Protestant champion. *The survey of London* notes there are more than thirty of these dedications in the London area alone. One such monument to Elizabeth was found in St. Michael Querne, dated 1616. Munday records the text.

> Here lied her Type, who was of late,  
> The prop of Belgia, flay of France, State,  
> Sapines foile, Faiths Shield, and Queene  
> Of Armes, of Learning, Fate and Chance:  
> Inbriefe, of Women never was seen,  
> So great a Prince, so good a Queene.112

Another similar word board singing the praises of Elizabeth was also cited in Munday’s text. It was at St. Mary le Bow, dated 1628, and reads:

> I have fought a good fight, I have finished  
> My course, I have kept the faith.  
> From henceforth is laid up for me a Crowne  
> Of Righteousnesse, which the Lord, the  
> righteous Iuge shall give mee at that  
> day; and not me onely, but to them also  
> that love his appearing. 2 Tim. 4-7, 8.113

These decorations extolled the previous monarch. Another important fact to be gleaned from this study is that these decorations were not made shortly after the queen’s death. The majority recorded by Munday were done in the late second decade of the 1600s and continued through the 1620s and 1630s, even after the death of James. Few monuments were done in honor of the first
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112 John Stow, Munday, et al., 849.

113 John Stow, Munday, et al., 849.
Stuart king of Great Britain in the 1620s or early 1630s. This is a telling statement about the rejection of the “ecumenical” policies of the late king and how unpopular they were after the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War. England looked back to the “good old” days of “Bess,” “flay of the French and Spanish.”

The examples of the rebuilding and decoration of churches in London given in this text tell us that the substantial motivations behind the rebuilding and redecoration of these churches were based in Protestant pride. They also accepted the challenge of Catholics who criticized the lack of piety in Protestant early modern England. These homage decorations to Queen Elizabeth were in some ways rejections of James and Charles’s movement of church polity. It was also a criticism of their failure to engage militarily Catholicism as Elizabeth had “in the good old days.” These decorations were sparse and spartan and were within the Calvinistic taste for plainness described in the chapter 3 of this study. But a few churches after 1620 did begin to follow anti-Calvinist tastes. (This will be discussed in following chapters.)

Some Jacobean church authorities were happy to exhort the revival of church building and decoration. But no evidence exists of the kind of pressure from common parishioners or merchant classes to decorate or to provide the revival in religious art that would follow during the reign of Charles and Archbishop Laud. On the contrary, The survey of London testified to an entrenched Calvinistic taste at the parochial level. However, an important text argued against the beatification or “popish” decorations of pre-Reformation churches, and it was regularly read in England from the time of Elizabeth through the early Stuart age. It was The second tome of homelyes.

The second tome of homelyes was a set of homilies to be read on certain important feast
days and was still required throughout the reign of the early Stuarts. The two most important homilies in the context of this study dealt with idolatry and with “proper” decoration. These homilies were to be read throughout the church year at special feasts. These occasions complemented the spirit or content of the homilies themselves in relation to the feasts celebrated.

The second homily in this collection, *an Homily against peryll of Idolatry and superfluous bedkyng of Churches,* is one of the longest homilies in the text. It warned against church decoration that looks like the decorations put up in the Catholic era of England and attacked the ceremony, religious statuary, offensive stained glass, and the painting of the old religion.

The Temple of the Lord, and the house of GOD, and that therefore the due reverence thereof, is stirred vp in the hearts of the godly, by the consideration of these true ornaments of the sayd house of GOD, and not by any outward ceremonies or costly and glorious decking of the sayd house or Temple of the Lord, contrary to the which most manifest doctrine of the Scriptures, and contrary to the vsage of the Primitiue Church . . . the corruption of these latter dayes, hath brought into the Church infinite multitudes of images, and the same, with other parts of the Temple also, haue decked with gold and siluer, painted with colours, set them with stone and pearle, clothed them with silkes and precious vestures, fancying vntruely that to be the chiefe decking and adorning of the Temple or house of GOD, and that all people should bee the more mooued to the due reverence of the same, if all corners thereof were glorious, and glistering with gold and precious stones. . . . And the couetous persons, by the same occasion, seeming to worship, and peraduenture worshipping indeed, not onely the images, but also the matter of them, gold and siluer, as that vice is of all others in the Scriptures peculiarly called idolatrie or worshipping of images (Ephesians 5.5, Colossians 3.5). . . . The reasons and arguments made for the defence of images or idols, and the outragious decking of Temples and Churches, with gold, siluer, pearle, and precious stone, shall be confuted, and so this whole matter concluded . . . likenesse or similitudes of men or other things images, and not idols: yet the Scriptures vse the sayd two words [idols and images] indifferently for one thing alway.116
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114 *The second tome of homelyes of such matters as were promised and intituled in the former part of homelyes set out by the aucthoritie of the Quenes Maiestie, and to be read in euery paryshe churche agreablye* (London: by Richard Jugge, and John Cawood, Prynters to the Quenes Maiestie, 1563).

115 *The second tome of homelyes,* 12-84.

It is clear from the homily that most artwork or “images” could be perceived as dangerous to the spiritual health of the believer. Calvin is followed lockstep by the author of this text. The author of this homily made no distinction between image and idol. They were the same. An Homily against peryll of Idolatry and superfluous bedkyng of Churches continued by quoting the Old Testament scriptures used for the justification of “cleansing” the English Church from most of its artistic tradition. Note that the homily in The second tome of homelyes for proper decoration and use of churches, for the repayrynge and kepyng cleane, and comely adournygne of Churches is less than one-twelfth the length of the homily against improper images and decoration of churches. Even here, we find a Puritan sparseness in a homily, which charged the listeners with proper upkeep of the church.

The difference between Jacobean and Caroline building and decoration was not quantitative but related to the quality of subject matter. Ornaments, utensils, lavish decoration of the church, and the renewed use of images were encouraged in the Laudian period. These seem to be absent in the descriptions found in Munday’s text for use in London churches during the latter part of Elizabeth’s reign, however their use came into fashion toward the end of the reign of James. Peter Lake has argued that the change in Laud--and those who thought like him--was ideologically charged. Lake argued that church fabric and furnishings did have direct doctrinal significance, a holiness derived from the divine presence within a consecrated church rather than simply from the presence of the people of God and a Bible. This was similar if not

117 For the movement on Laudian policies toward furnishing and church decoration, see Nicolas Tyacke’s Anti-Calvinists (Oxford, 1987), especially Chapter 8, and Davies, The Caroline Captivity of the Church, Chapters 2 and 6. Both theses authors documented a rather sharp shift back toward the Catholic pre-Reformation tastes in Laudianism.
identical to the viewpoint of Catholicism about the “sacredness” of church buildings before and after the Reformation.

For Lake, the ideological move toward the “beauty of holiness,” for consecration to God’s worship, and for sanctity to all objects employed in worship made statements about the faith of James and Charles. For Arminians and anti-Calvinists and for James, as he entered the end of his reign, art, decorations, and “religious imagery” took on more and more importance. Charles would emphasize this ideology considerably. The creation of works that followed would extol the divine, sacredness of the monarchy.

**Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes and the Beauty of Worship**

That Andrewes was the epitome of “Anglicanism” is a given by historians. Hooker also was a most creative apologist of the *via media*. Both allowed for and encouraged what has been noted as the “beauty of worship.” In Nigel Volk’s *Richard Hooker and Reformed Theology*, Volk argued against the consensus of revisionist historians that Hooker was a proponent of mainstream Protestantism. Volk, with his examination of the later writings of Hooker, argued for a more traditional Hooker, who looked backward and argued for a more pre-reformed view of the English Church as reflected in his criticism of Puritanism. In this view, Hooker emerges as a conservative who paradoxically came to occupy a remarkably individual and innovative position as a founder of an ideology associated with Arminianism. High churchmen looked back to traditionalist precursors who, like Hooker, had argued pre-reformation positions on free will, the possibility of losing grace, merit, and the paramount place of episcopal authority. Their views were more closely aligned to the medieval Catholic positions than to the positions of Geneva or
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Edinburgh. Volk particularly noted the later works of Hooker in which he defended his view of the English Church. Hooker’s view was under attack, accused of popery because of his more traditional interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Volk wrote that this attack came in A Christian Letter, which had correctly perceived that Hooker’s theology in the True Lawes was moving away from the Reformed tradition, particularly in his view of human nature and the availability of grace for all.

Unlike Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes has been able to withstand the effort by revisionists to change him into a Reformed theologian. Born in 1555, he came from an ancient Suffolk family and was one of the most conservative and Catholic-minded of all the thinkers and bishops during the reigns of Elizabeth and James. He was legendary in his own time at Oxford for his scholarship and took Holy Orders in 1580. Recognized as a great preacher, he was a chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, James I, and Archbishop Whitgift. Andrewes is widely seen as the first “Anglo-Catholic” by those who distinguish an English Catholic movement separate from Roman Catholicism. His “Catholicism” is evident in a majority of his writings, especially his daily meditations, which were often published, and were some of the most popular religious devotional works of early modern England. Laud even “molded” Andrewes’s sermons in
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119 Nigel Volk, Richard Hooker and Reformed Theology: A Study of Reason, Will and Grace (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), Chapters 3, 5, and conclusion. Through a careful study of Hooker’s works, it can be concluded that he essentially was defending a more traditional viewpoint of human nature, sin, grace, and the importance of works in his theology than seen in the revisionism of the last 25 years.

120 Andrew Willet, A Christian letter of certaine English Protestants, vnfained fauourers of the present state of religion, authorized . . . . (Middelburg: Printed by Richard Schilders, 1599).

121 Volk’s conclusion that Willet and others had read Hooker correctly. Hooker represented a view that the Reformation had gone too far.
publication so that they would reflect the tradition of sermon writing and presentation of sermons established by Pope Leo the Great. In 1598, Andrewes turned down both the dioceses of Ely and Salisbury. He would have been made bishop by Elizabeth but refused the miter because he felt it was wrong to divert ecclesiastical revenues to the crown. He supported James’s return of funds to the church and the clergy.

During James’s reign, Andrewes’s preaching was legendary about the support of absolutism, love of ceremony, church decoration, and the arts. Andrewes was the first on the list of divines appointed to compile the Authorized Version of the Bible. He took charge of the first books of the Old Testament from Genesis to Second Kings. In a way, he acted as a general editor of the project. In 1605, he was consecrated Bishop of Chichester and made Lord High Almoner. Andrewes traveled in 1617 with James to Scotland with a view to persuading the Scots that the episcopacy was preferable to their Presbyterian form of church government. He attended the synod of Dort, and was made dean of the Royal Chapel, then translated to Winchester diocese. He was buried by the high altar at Southwark Cathedral, which at the time was in the diocese of Winchester.

Andrewes argued that James had the right to use the title “Catholic.” This was explained in his First Answer to Cardinal Perron. Regarding the ceremony and the Eucharist, he was staunch in his defense of the Eucharist and in the beatification of churches because of the divine mysteries that were held therein. Only Laud may have surpassed his conservative views about
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123 Trevor A. Owen, 14.
124 Trevor A. Owen, 14.
episcopacy, divine right of kings (and bishops), and the importance of the use of art. Andrewes said,

As to the Real Presence, we are agreed, our controversy [with Rome] is as to the mode of it. As to the mode, we define nothing rashly, nor anxiously investigate, any more than in the Incarnation of Christ we ask how the human is united to the divine nature in One Person. There is a real change in the elements —we allow \textit{ut panis iamconsecratus non sit panis quem natura formavistsed, quem benedicto cones rvit, et consecrando etiam immutavit.}’’\textsuperscript{125}

James also believed in the real presence as something that was a divine mystery that should not be debated.\textsuperscript{126} This was particularly an anti-Calvinist view. Andrewes also believed that adoration of the Eucharist was permitted and that the terms “sacrifice” and “altar” were consonant with scripture and antiquity: Christ “as sacrificed—so, to be slain; a propitiatory sacrifice so, to be eaten.”\textsuperscript{127} These views were diametrically opposed to Calvinism and to the majority of English Protestants. Andrewes was one of James’s favored preachers, no doubt because of their agreement on Absolutism and church history. His sermons had a loving, positive quality that was often in short supply in an age of aggressive confessionalism.

\textsuperscript{125} Lancelot Andrewes, \textit{Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini, quam nuper edidit contra præfationem monitoriam Serenissimi ac potentissimi principis Iacobi . . .} (Londini: Excudebat Robertus Barkerus, serenissae Regiae Maiestatis typographus, Anno 1610), 263.

\textsuperscript{126} For the most recent views of James on the Eucharist, see W. B. Patterson \textit{King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom}, pages 134, 135 and 323, 324 and 343. Here Patterson presented evidence that James’s understanding of the Eucharist was much closer to a Roman Catholic understanding than to a Calvinist one. “James argued that the English Church had not rejected the ideas of presence of Christ and the sacrifice in the Eucharist, as du Perron claimed, but held them in the sense that the ancients had. Thus the Church of England believed Christ’s words, “This is my body to refer to the bread in the Eucharist, but was not inquisitive about the manner of Christ’s presence in the element of bread, holding this to be a sacred mystery,” 134-135.

Bishop Andrewes: Tradition and the Royal Chapels

From the time he was made a royal chaplain, Andrewes often preached on the most important feast days and commemorations including Christmas, Easter, Holy Thursday, and Ascension Day. Favored royal preachers defended the royal supremacy, as they did during the reign of Elizabeth; however, preachers such as Andrewes grew supportive of divine right and preached in more splendor during the latter part of James’s reign. One of the reasons James liked this learned and saintly preacher was his commitment to monarchy and his anti-Calvinist preaching style, which was rather encouraging in that most of Andrewes’s sermons portrayed a loving God who would favorably judge those who followed the moderate Christianity James championed.

Nicholas Tyacke identified Andrewes as one of the most important anti-Calvinists who championed the beauty of worship. Andrewes, as one of the most important Jacobean preachers, was constantly called upon by James for service inside and outside of the English Church. James chose Andrewes and Inigo Jones to provide a setting of royal theater in the chapels, which were renovated toward the end of James’s reign. For James, bishops were part of the governing apparatus he was trying to strengthen. Andrewes’s ecclesiological theory of prayer, ritual, and decoration made him suitable for the tasks of informing these renovations.

As a prolific writer, Andrewes was known for his Devotions, which were often opposed to Reformed thinking. Some of Andrewes’s beliefs were certainly pro-Catholic in position, particularly his meditation on the Virgin Mary in The Preces Privatae of Lancelot Andrewes. In a


129 It is unclear if Andrewes realized that this would be published after his death. It is one of the most important works to show his true theological positions.
decidedly un-Lutheran or Reformed view, he referred to her as “the all holy, immaculate, more than blessed mother of God and ever virgin Mary.”\footnote{Lancelot Andrewes, \textit{The Preces Privatae of Lancelot Andrewes}, trans. and ed., F. E. Brightman (London, 1903: rpt. New York: Living Age Books, 1961), 85.} The “visualization” of his \textit{Devotions} was a logical outcome. One of the major renovations personally taken on by Laud, Andrewes’s most faithful disciple, was a monumental statue group and new entrance to St. Mary the Virgin Church in Oxford (Figure 4-4). In this group, also known as the Virgin Porch, Solomonic columns flank the life-sized virgin and child with the connotation that Mary is a seat of wisdom. The use of these columns, as noted in Chapter 2, has Eucharistic implications as well.

Andrewes was a bridge to pre-Reformation thinking and to Catholic Counter-Reformation thought. His concerns were with the notion of Apostolic Succession and the importance of tradition as he considered it a necessary fact of human nature. For him, we must in some way trust what has already been proven or believed. He emphasized the importance of liturgy and prayer, which also de-emphasized the importance of preaching in favor of liturgy.\footnote{Maurice F. Reidy, S. J., \textit{Lancelot Andrewes: Jacobean Court Preacher} (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1995), 217.} Andrewes’s theology was not novel; it was steeped in admiration of the early church, its councils and writings. Nicholas Lossky did a careful study of the \textit{LXVI Sermons} of Andrewes, in which Andrewes in general showed his reverence for church fathers and Christian antiquity. This led him to develop a theological system that was reliant on the model of the early church.\footnote{Nicholas Lossky, \textit{Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher (1555-1626)}, tr. Andrew Louth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).} Respect for the early traditions of Roman and Greek fathers was paramount in his thought. In Lossky’s analysis of Andrewes, not much linked him to reformed traditions. Lossky wrote:

\begin{enumerate}
\item\footnote{Maurice F. Reidy, S. J., \textit{Lancelot Andrewes: Jacobean Court Preacher} (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1995), 217.}
\item\footnote{Nicholas Lossky, \textit{Lancelot Andrewes the Preacher (1555-1626)}, tr. Andrew Louth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).}
\end{enumerate}
Each sermon, in one way or another, has recourse to the incomprehensible mystery of the emptying of the Second Person of the Trinity, of the taking hold of time by the eternal, of space by the incommensurable. . . . The implication is always the old patristic adage, which Andrewes forcefully reformulates for his own time: ‘God has become man, that man might become God.’

This notion would have been seen as heretical if not blasphemous by most that followed the Reformed tradition. Andrewes was thoroughly incarnational and believed in the corporal nature of Christ’s revelation.

Beginning in the 1610s, Andrewes preached many sermons that concentrated on the king as the absolute and divinely ordained ruler over both church and state. Indeed, his view of “deification” was helpful for those who believed in Absolutism and easily lent itself to expression in Stuart dynastic artwork. Deification or the return of all creation to a pristine state also had implications for the beauty of worship or decoration in the church. Through art and architecture, Christian man was to reflect the beauty of the Christian message in his works. Through church art, Christians reflected on the microcosm of God’s macrocosm in heaven.

Andrewes rejected the doctrine of total depravity. His works lacked the notion of the completeness of the corruption of humanity, which was expressed by Luther, Calvin, and their supporters. Free will and man’s ability to participate in the salvation process allowed him far more dexterity in thinking about man’s contribution toward salvation, while still emphasizing the graciousness of God. In review of his extensive writings, the beauty of worship or the physical expression of beauty would be strongly encouraged, and in some ways necessary in his theological system. No doubt, he earned his reputation in history as one of the first “English

---

133 Nicholas Lossky. See pages 32 and 33 where Lossky described the “deification” process that Andrewes championed.
Catholics” due to his more pre-Reformation viewpoint and his adherence to early Latin and Greek Christian thought.

His theological and spiritual talents were pressed into service in 1621 and 1622 when the Whitehall royal chapel was renovated with an eye toward the Spanish Match. Andrewes, as dean, was involved with this refurbishing, which included repainting the Tudor ceiling and refurbishing a schema of wall paintings that included human figures.134 Around the same time, a Catholic chapel was begun at St. James in preparation for receiving the Spanish Infanta if the negotiations were successful.135 The nature of these renovations can be seen in The Solemnization of the Spanish Marriage Treaty (A-59). Both redecorations included new mural paintings that were pleasing to Catholic aesthetics.136 It is clear in the creation of these chapels that James was open to images and the crucifix for political reasons to mollify his expected daughter-in-law. Tables were moved to positions of altars as in Catholic practice. Fresh murals of saints were placed on the walls. In “accommodating” Catholic tastes for worship in his royal chapel at Whitehall, he also continued to use the ancient west work or closet over the west end in the renovation.

James ordered his chaplains to celebrate the royal ceremonies for himself and the court “as neared the Romane Forme as can lawfullie be done for it hasth ever bene my waye to goe with the churche of rome usque ad aras.”137 Most historians see this as a political ploy; however,

134 History of the Kings Works, 4: 314.

135 History of the Kings Works, 4: 116.

136 History of the Kings Works, 4: 117.

James seems to have grown more genuinely conservative toward the end of his life. These renovations might also have been for personal taste. He certainly did appoint more “traditionalist” chaplains and bishops at the end of his life who would have supported such liturgy and decoration. But he did not “purify” the chapels when the Spanish Match evaporated or when it was under attack from the press or criticism from court figures.

The engraving *Solemnization of the Spanish Marriage Treaty in the Whitehall Chapel Royal, July 1623,* (A-59) shows the composition of the chapel. It is clearly set up altar wise with a side chapel as close to a Catholic altar as possible. Behind the main altar are obvious religious paintings that were discussed by contemporaries. A table had been brought in for the solemn signing of the marriage treaty with the Spanish ambassador for the hand of the Spanish Infanta. The crucifix, which was part of Elizabeth’s personal chapel and had been attacked, was returned to use at this time. Sir Thomas Knyvett remarked in one of his writings that “the kings Chappell at Whitehall is curiously painted and all the images newe made and a silver crucifix amaking to hange therin, against the spannish Ladys coming.”\textsuperscript{138} Even when the Spanish Lady did not come, the chapel was not returned to its former decoration.

Political expediency may have played a large role in these decorations. Fincham and Lake wrote that James had to abandon mainstream Calvinism in his effort to secure a marriage settlement with Spain.\textsuperscript{139} As James aged and knew that his life was ending, the more positive preaching of favorites, such as Andrewes and others, religious works of art, and the beauty of ceremony gave comfort to a dying old man. James had always been theologically versatile and

\textsuperscript{138} The Knyvett Letters (1620-1644), ed., Bertram Schofield (1949), 56. Birch argued in *Court and times of James,* vol. II, page 400, that the crucifix was in place by 1623.

somewhat open-minded and expansive when it came to religion. He certainly did not turn toward the harsh Calvinism expressed by members of his own family, such as Elizabeth and her husband, The Elector.

Even James blamed The Elector for foolishly provoking the Thirty Years’ War by his adventure in Bohemia, which included a massive iconoclastic attack on the cathedral in Prague. As an amateur theologian and as one who sought to reconcile most of Christianity during his reign—even moderate Catholics, it would have been a rather scant heaven for him if Catholics were excluded. This exclusion would have included the two most important women of his life—his mother, a militant and unapologetic Catholic to the end, and his wife Anne, who discreetly practiced the faith.

As claimed in *Basilikon Doron*, James could move the church in whichever direction it suited him, for political reasons, or for his own personal spirituality, perhaps even both. For whatever reason, it is clear that at the end of his reign James moved the royal chapel toward a Catholic aesthetic. In 1623, he also put Andrewes in charge of the commissioned renovation of the chapel at Greenwich. The result was to be a work that was an example of the theories of divine right and royal supremacy that had been proclaimed from court pulpits. The Chapel at Greenwich employed the Catholic iconography of England’s pre-Reformation past, and it was completely sympathetic with Catholic Baroque tastes of the period. As Dean of the Chapter, Bishop Andrewes’s charge was to “cause Greenwich Chapel to be new repaired and gilded, being much decayed, as not having been new furnished since Queen Mary’s [Tudor] days.”

As master of the king’s works, Inigo Jones was in charge of the entire decorative scheme. Andrewes once again acted as a theological overseer.¹⁴¹

These renovations, with their presentation of the communion table as altar-wise, inclusion of religious art, chalices rather than communion cups, and the reintroduction of the crucifix and candles, also clearly mark the unprecedented influence of the prelates and preachers who were often closer to Roman Catholicism’s polity than to Calvinistic plain style. These anti-Calvinists were initiating something like an Arminian Counter-Reformation as early as the late period of James’s reign, at least in the royal chapels.

The chapels provided image to the theory of religious and political Absolutism. They not only joined but also made inseparable this view of absolutism in early Stuart England. The chapel interior, structurally and ichnographically, offered one of the most telling portraits of this union of church and state. In a 1622 sermon, William Laud characterized James as “a mediate fountanine of Gods Goodness and bounty streaming to the people.”¹⁴² Anthony Rudd, Bishop of St. David’s, spoke in the same terms when he imagined the court and peers looking up to James as an intercessor like one of the Old Testament kings: “Now imagine with me, that Dauid sitting aloft in his Chaire of estate looketh downe to his subiects saying, Saluation belongeth vnto the lord; And then casting vppe his eyes to Heaven, by and Apostrophe to God saith thus. And thy blessing is Vppon thy people.”¹⁴³ The ornate decorations of chapel ceilings, like the one which still survived from the time of Henry VIII (decorated while Henry was still a Catholic) at

¹⁴¹ History of the Kings Works, 4: 116-118.


Hampton Court, with its dangling cherubs and angels, blue ceiling, and imitation of stars were imitated by James and Charles in their royal chapels. These were literally and figuratively meant to be windows into heaven above to capture a glimpse of the divine in and through the royal presence. As John Donne put it in one of his most important court sermons, Donne’s first, “as Princes are Gods, so their well-govern’d Courts, are Copies, and representations of Heaven.”

The chapels were not the only place that the English could glimpse their “prince-gods.” Something reminiscent of a chapel is seen at the Banqueting House. It has been suggested that the Banqueting House imaged royal chapels in that the king presided over the masques from an elevated dais at the far end of the Hall, as he did with an elevated seat in the rear of the royal chapels. The masques were quasi-religious celebrations in light of this conformation to royal chapel architecture. Therefore, the Banqueting House was more than a place for state affairs. The theory of James and Charles’s Absolutism made the Banqueting House integral in that it interconnected religious thought to political thought. David Harris Sacks pointed out that the royal chapels had frequently served as theaters during the Henrican times and that the parallel between the chapels and Banqueting Houses may have been platonic, but their functions were religious, and the masques were to court life as the taking of communion was to church life.

Bishops were part of this religious-political dialogue, and they could make their careers by
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supporting the view of James on policy. Though Laud is most connected with Charles, it is important to note that James advanced him because Laud tended to support the peaceful foreign policies of James, as well as Absolutism. James was increasingly under attack for his notion of integrating England more fully into Catholic Europe with the Spanish Match. As the Thirty Years’ War wore on, James was under considerable pressure to intervene in the Palatinate in favor of his daughter and son-in-law. Laud, who had carefully served as royal chaplain since 1611 and who noticeably copied the preaching style and the decorative innovations of Andrewes, preached a sermon before the king on James’s birthday, 19 June 1621. Laud took as his text the sixth and seventh verses of Psalm 122: “Pray for the peace of Jerusalem; let them prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy Places.” 147 This of course praised the king’s policies of peaceful diplomacy, would have irritated those in Parliament and the court that were for military intervention, and an end to any talk of a Catholic princess. Laud preached: “cannot bee accounted only the Grown-mans, or the weakemans Prayer [that] it is not cowardize to pray for peace: nor courage to call for troubles.” 148 Laud was rewarded no less than ten days later with the diocese of St. David’s after this sermon. The supportive homily was immediately sent to press by royal command.

With James’s dream of a Hapsburg alliance increasingly being challenged, a continued call rang out for James to intervene on the side of Protestantism. Rather than James’s expansive and peaceful policy, parliament and critics of the Stuarts advised a confessional foreign policy with England as the leader of the Protestant reaction to Catholicism’s “advance.” James


increasingly turned to preachers and prelates whose more traditional pre-Reformation theology “allowed them to endorse his foreign policy.”\textsuperscript{149} In their moderate religious views, they also allowed a continued “flirtation” with Catholicism.

\textbf{Pre-Reformation Themes in a Monumental Sculpture in the Reign of James I}

Courtiers often flattered King James with references to his similarities to Solomon or one of the great Roman rulers. James did not disagree; he relished the comparisons. The \textit{Tower of the Orders} (Figure 4-5) at Oxford University was built in 1624 and decorated with monumental sculpture. It certainly affords one important example that illustrates the burgeoning affection for the classical Greek and Roman era and style to which James and others at court wanted to connect themselves. “Oxford’s devotion to the Stuart monarchy was underlined by a decision taken in 1620 to carve a statue of King James I on the fourth storey”\textsuperscript{150} interior court of the Bodleian library gate. A monumental work joins James with Christian imperial and biblical themes. The classical orders (from bottom to top)--Tuscan, Doric, Ionic and Corinthian columns--were used to frame the entranceway to one of the most important libraries in England. On the fourth register is a monumental and over life-sized statue of James as a Roman Emperor/Christ the King figure (Figure 4-6). James, seated between an Angel/Virtue and a kneeling maiden to his left, presents books symbolically to the university. This work was created to celebrate James’s gifts of his papers to the library at Oxford. Above the canopy are the words, “blessed are the peacemakers” in Latin, along with James’s personal coat of arms. Overall, the composition is done in the style of an Annunciation scene reminiscent of the Renaissance.


In the late 1500s, Lodovico Dolce, in his *Dialogo della pitture, intitolato l’Aretino* and Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo in his *Trattato dell’arte della pittura, scultura ed architettura*, explained the theory of seeing classical or antiquity-inspired portraiture in a closer context with religious art.\(^\text{151}\) Both Renaissance Italian writers, in particular Dolce, defended religious art, and traced the origins of religious art from the appreciation of the virtuous ancestor in antiquity. Dolce’s basis of antique hero worship as the foundation for religious art is found in his preface for portraiture, where he maintained that the church’s use of images comes from ancient traditions of heroic political figures. His example was Caesar meditating on Alexander the Great and other “ancestral” images. Clearly, the work portraying James at the Bodleian in Oxford is meant to evoke the Great King hero. Lomazzo devoted one entire chapter in his treatise to the inspirational values of this art form, the portrait. The portrait, whether in stone or paint, therefore preserved the memory of the great ones and promoted their imitation and reverence. For Dolce and Lomazzo, the portrait validates the Roman Church’s use of its own “ancestral” images, the angels and the saints.\(^\text{152}\)

Both Italian writers believed in the value of political portraiture and of the religious example of virtue as a justification of Christian images. For them, classicizing “statues of Marcus Aurelius [thought to be Constantine the Great] and Constantine were props of Christian virtue to equal the crucifix.”\(^\text{153}\) Evidence shows that many of the same ideals and theories expressed by


\(^{153}\) Margaret Aston, “Gods, Saints, and Reformers...,” 203.
these Italian art theoreticians were absorbed by those collecting art and traveling in Catholic areas of Europe, especially after James achieved peace between England and the Hapsburgs. This notion is evident in the collections of antiquarians such as Arundel, discussed in Chapter 5, and in his influence on Henry and Charles.

What is important about the portrayal of James at Oxford is the imagery from which this statue of James is drawn. When one carefully examines this work, *James I giving his published works to the University of Oxford* (Figure 4-6), one can see that it is based on imperial images such as Lucas de Here’s *Philip II as Solomon* (A-14) and the central panel on the Sarcophagus of *Junius Bassus* (Figure 2-3) as well as one of the central Christian images, *The Annunciation to Mary*.

According to Geoffrey Tyack, the statue group was most likely done by the sculptor John Clark, son-in-law of the mason John Akroyd, who was responsible for the creation of the tower.154 The inscription beneath the group reads: “When the Lord James was reigning, most learned, most munificent, best of kings, these structures [were] happily attempted, begun, completed. Glory to God alone.”155 On the books presented to the school held by James are the words in Latin *Haec Habeo Quae Scripsi. Haec Habeo Quae Dedi* (These things I have which I have written, these things I have which I have given).156 This is not the wisdom of an ordinary man but of God’s anointed. This sculptural group “works” completely with the theories that James had about Absolutism—the king places himself in direct connection and in line with God as an intercessor between his kingdom and God, once again in the great chain of being. This

154 Geoffrey Tyack, 18.
155 Geoffrey Tyack, 18.
156 Geoffrey Tyack, 18.
theme was repeated often in *Basilikon Doron* and other works in the *Fürstenspiegel* or *speculum principis* tradition that provided propaganda for kingship.

**Conclusion**

As documented in this chapter, James began a journey away from the traditions of Calvinism and the example set by Elizabeth in his political and religious thoughts expressed in the *Basilikon Doron*. This was also demonstrated in his shift from plain churches and chapels for highly traditional decorative schemes that were similar in taste and expression to Catholicism. Some of his subjects noticed his divergence from the *status quo*. James embraced classical forms in art and architecture in a more positive way. Puritans celebrated Elizabeth as the proper model for monarchy as noted in *The Survey of London*, and often romanticized about her being the true model of a Protestant monarch. James returned to pre-reformed models for his chapel in anticipation of a Spanish princess, fitted out to appear as close to the old religion as possible.

Chapter 5 will continue to document his movement and indeed his struggle and infatuation with Catholicism through the legacy of his mother, Mary Queen of Scots, and the creation of her magnificent tomb (Figures 1-1, 1-2, 1-3).
Figure 4-1. *Pantheon.* In 609, the Byzantine emperor Phocas gave the building to Pope Boniface IV, who converted it into a Christian church and consecrated it to Santa Maria, ad Martyres, now known as Santa Maria dei Martiri. Photo by author.

Figure 4-2. In 1539, Pope Paul III, making a visit to Assisi, ordered the *Temple of Minerva* to be completely restored and dedicated to the Virgin Mary. The temple then took the name of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. Photo by author.
Figure 4-3. Inigo Jones. *West Front of the Banqueting House*, Whitehall Palace. 1619-1622. Photo by author.

Figure 4-4. *The Virgin Porch*, 1637, the High Street entrance to St. Mary’s, Oxford. The setting up of the ‘scandalous’ statue of the Virgin and Child was one of the many charges brought against Archbishop Laud in 1641. Photo by author.
Figure 4-5. *Tower of the Orders*, Oxford University, 1624. Photo by author.

Figure 4-6. *James I giving his published works to the University of Oxford*. Bodleian Library. Early 1620’s. Photo by author.
CHAPTER 5
ART AND CATHOLIC INFLUENCE: THE EARLY YEARS OF CHARLES I

Introduction

This chapter will examine the key influences on Charles, including the legacy of Mary Queen of Scots, his mother Anne of Denmark, his older brother Henry Prince of Wales, Lords Cecil, Buckingham, and Arundel, and his wife Henrietta Maria. Included in this chapter are discussions of clergymen associated with the court and their religious and artistic sensibilities. The movement of the English Church toward a Catholic “perspective” in art and liturgy are essential to an understanding of Charles’s contributions. All of these figures helped form the artistic direction of the dynasty toward a more conservative religious expression of art that supported divine right of kings. Charles’s display of art aimed to further the cause of absolutism in England.

New Direction in the Use and Collection of Art

Surprisingly, Charles Stuart frequently asserted that he was Catholic, but not Roman Catholic—no more than the French king was Roman Catholic.\(^1\) The art Charles used was borrowed, and only slightly reinterpreted, with most of its Catholic symbolism still intact. It is true that these works of art were put into use for a Protestant regime; however, they were so similar to works produced by Catholic powers on the continent that Puritans found it difficult to distinguish them from works produced in Italy, Spain, the Catholic Netherlands, and The Empire. One of the reasons for confusion was that those who were members of the merchant

classes, as well as the aristocracy, were now traveling. They saw the wonders created in the Catholic south. They had trouble differentiating Catholic works from those of Charles’s artwork.

One reason for the change in the use of art in early modern England was that Englishmen were well received in Catholic Europe, where they were exposed to a new artistic world. James re-established embassies in Brussels, Venice, Florence, and Madrid after a gap of nearly four decades. These embassies functioned as convenient agencies for art collectors and for some like Carleton, the ambassador to Venice, as channels for royalty such as Prince Henry to acquire his excellent collection. The relative freedom of travel also allowed many others to see buildings and art not yet imagined in the British Isles.

Détente was successful during the majority of Charles’s reign. After Rubens’s successful negotiations between Charles and Philip III, a significant number of Englishmen traveled to Europe in the 1630s. Treating the English well was a not-so-conspicuous plan by the papacy and other Catholic powers to help urge England back into the Catholic fold, especially for political and economic reasons. This allowed many to collect art, to be impressed by the great collections of princes and other nobles, to see spectacular buildings, and to bring tremendous amounts of previously undesirable religious art back to England.

Certain English Catholic priests were central to this endeavor. The two most important English Catholic priests were noblemen. Most notorious in this group of converts was the son of the Archbishop of York, Tobie Matthew, and his constant companion George Gage. Matthew and Gage remained in Rome for much of their careers, buying Counter-Reformation art and providing art to the nobility of England, both Protestant and Catholic. Matthew, and likely

---

Gage, joined the Society of Jesus and were ordained by no less a Catholic prelate than Cardinal Bellarmine. Yet James used these unapologetic Catholics as ambassadors to Spain during the negotiations for the hand of the Infanta in the 1620s. Top-level negotiations earned Matthew a knighthood and Gage a royal reward of £375.3

Their Catholicism was extremely advantageous when they negotiated with such painters as Rubens and Van Dyck. It was also invaluable in deals with Italian collectors. Their Jesuit connection especially helped with Van Dyck, a devout Catholic who had joined a Jesuit confraternity in 1628. Van Dyck, like Gage, had a sister who was a nun in a Flemish convent.4 The Venetian ambassador described Gage as chief of the English Catholics and as the shrewdest connoisseur of his day. Gage was instrumental in recommending Van Dyck as court painter to Charles.

Edward Chaney identified important Catholics and Catholic sympathizers as essential to the development of the collection and use of art in early modern England. Chaney wrote:

It is then no accident that, with the possible exceptions of William Petty (part-time Anglican clergyman) and Balthazar Gerbier (who was all things to all men), the early Stuart art agents were Roman Catholics. Like Matthew and Gage, Robert Cansfield (cousin of Arundel and companion of Roos), Anthony Tracy (servant of Arundel and brother-in-law of the fellow Catholic Wenceslas Hollar), Walter Montague (convert son of the Earl of Manchester), Nicholas Lanier (royal musician and artist), David Codner (Benedictine and probably Milton’s mysterious ‘Selvaggi’), Daniel Nys (French-born art dealer), Peter Fitton (Richard Lassels’s friend and fellow priest) and John Price (Anthony Wood’s ‘greatest critic of this time’) were all effectively exiled at one time or another, This rendered them trustworthy in the eyes of the continental hosts whilst keeping them anxious to please their influential compatriots. A closely related class of occasional art agents were the more respectable royal servants, Endymion Porter, Sir Dudley Carleton, Sir William Hamilton, Basil, Lord Fielding and Sir Kenelm Digby, at least three of whom were also portrayed by Van Dyck and were Catholics.5

---

3 Edward Chaney, 209.

4 Edward Chaney, 209.

The influence on art by the men on this list was immeasurable because of their guidance in style, taste, and art usage.

But change was not immediate. It was only after 1610 that a significant number of collectors began to acquire artwork on a large scale. Leading courtiers such as Buckingham hired art experts such as Balthazar Gerbier, who collected art on his behalf for five years. When the great painter Rubens came to England in 1629, he commented on the magnificent collections of the British aristocracy. This twenty-year period saw a vast change in art collection, commission, and in the newly appreciated taste for religious art. It also signaled the beginning of the regime’s use of art on a grand imperial scale, something not seen since pre-Reformation times.

The leading figure in this cultural change was the eldest son of James and Anne, Prince Henry. Henry established an independent household at Oatlands, and his court soon rivaled his father’s in size and status. The Venetian ambassador Foscarini described it as an “academy of young nobles.” Henry pursued his own interests in art and politics from an early age and was extremely influential on his younger brother Charles, who worshiped his handsome, intelligent, and altogether dashing older brother. As with Charles, Henry was an innovator from the beginning. He was the first to import Renaissance bronze statues. The prince “greatly delighted in all kinds of rare inventions and art . . . in limming and painting, carving, in all sorts of excellent and rare Pictures, such he had brought unto him from all countries.” As Prince of Wales, he purchased fifteen bronzes from Cosimo II in connection with marriage negotiations of 1611. These were most likely the first Italian sculptures to reach England since Henry VIII’s

6 Calendar of State Papers Venetian, XII (1610-1613), 464.

7 Sir Charles Cornwallis, The Life and Death of Our Late Most Incomparable and Heroique prince, Henry, Prince of Wales: A Prince (for Valour and Vertue) fit to be Imitated in Succeeding Times (London: printed by John Dawson for Nathanael Butter 1641), 100-101.
break with Rome. Art began to take a central place in the culture of early modern England through Henry.

Nobles who were attracted to the vibrant court of Henry included Pembroke, Arundel, Northampton, and Lenox. Thomas Howard (1585-1646), the Earl of Arundel, was particularly instrumental in cultural change. He sent agents throughout Europe, even dispatching some to the Ottoman Empire to search for antiquities. Arundel established the first collection of ancient statues now kept at the Ashmolean museum.

Other court figures followed. Prince Henry appointed Inigo Jones as Surveyor of Works in 1610. Though initially discovered and promoted by Anne, Jones’s connection to the crown prince was extremely important to his elevation in English society. It was through Prince Henry that Arundel and Jones became close associates. Jones traveled with the Arundels on his second trip through most of the important centers of Europe in 1614. His association with them fostered Jones’s movement toward classical architecture.

**The Loosening Grip of Calvinism: Cecil, Religion, and Art**

In this period, the hold of Calvinism on the English cultural mindset was challenged. Historians continue to question the appeal of Puritanism, with its plain churches, a theology, which predestined most people to eternal perdition, and its long sermons. As discussed in
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Chapter 3, authors have pointed out that Elizabeth and her hierarchy crushed the Presbyterian/Puritan movement to convert the English Church to a form of Presbyterianism in the 1590s. Arminians or anti-Calvinists slowly took on important roles in the English Church after this defeat of Presbyterianism. With gradual anti-Calvinist ascendancy to important dioceses in England, the use of religious art or even Catholic-like decoration of churches gained momentum. It is important to note that nearly to a man the anti-Calvinists were supporters of absolutism. By the time of Charles, the use of art by the dynasty for political use also rapidly accelerated. The crown and most of the important courtiers embraced baroque art based on the works of great Catholic artists. Their commissions appeared more similar to Catholic princes or clergymen on the continent than to Elizabeth’s tradition.

James differentiated himself from Elizabeth in other ways. He was generally lax on Catholicism. This was evidenced by his relationship with his wife Anne and those he chose as councilors. Queen Anne herself had refused to take part in Anglican Communion even at her coronation. The initial Privy Council included Catholics such as Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, and Henry Perce, Earl of Northumberland, who was sympathetic to Catholic recusants. These men were actively hostile toward Calvinism.\(^{11}\) Robert Cecil, First Earl of Salisbury, showed his leaning toward Catholicism by the end of his life by emphasizing the sacraments in his will in 1612\(^{12}\) and creating a chapel early on in James’s reign at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, which was set up very closely to Catholic tastes. Many of his closest
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\(^{11}\) David Harris Wilson, *King James VI & I* (London: Cape, 1950), 156, 178, 221, 156.

friends were also Catholic. Cecil, proud and powerful, was a force unto himself. He moved between contradictory groups at will.

Cecil’s chapel was dedicated in 1614, less than two years after his death, and completed to his specified design. The fact that it was even “dedicated” showed movement away from Protestant sensibilities. “In the absence of any direction from central authority, patrons were at first uncertain as to what constituted a Protestant domestic chapel . . . whether they were regarded as ‘sacred spaces’ or not. By the end of Elizabeth’s reign there is evidence of a revival of interest in the form of the traditional pre-Reformation chapel, culminating in the building of new chapels such as that at Hatfield House.”13 The chapel at Hatfield was not doubt created for a high-church patron who was interested in the designs of the pre-Reformation. However, it was heavily influenced by designs from Italy. Note the Roman arched windows rather than the pointed arches that one would have found in pre-Reformation England (A-60). The gallery retains its original decoration of portraits of Apostles and Evangelists in the roundels under each arch. Cecil had imported these paintings (A-61) from Italy and he commissioned stained-glass windows such as *Old Testament Scenes* (A-62). These are the original windows. The glass at Hatfield is richly colored, and even though the scenes are taken from the Old Testament, they are defined and accompanied by phrases that show a biblical reference or parallel to the New Testament. A good example of window treatment is the Passover Feast linked with the institution of the Eucharist. These scenes show the Old Testament and avoid depictions of scenes that would be too controversial, such as the Lord’s Supper. However, even with the scenes nuanced,

the glazing of the chapel was a bold advance, and, in fact, the chapel was distinctively un-Protestant for its time. The upper chapel, with its long side galleries, looked down onto a communion table set altar-wise and raised on a platform approached by two steps.\textsuperscript{14}

The lower chapel and the gallery have architectural treatments with \textit{trompe l’oeil} Ionic pilasters gilded and painted blue. Incorporated in blue and gold throughout the decorative schema of the chapel are winged cherub heads, flaming urns, and Bible-book motifs. There was a great deal of painted decoration, including the ceiling; however, these subjects were not recorded. The chapel ceiling was whitewashed in 1644 due to the iconoclastic tendencies prevalent during the Civil War. The ceiling burned completely in the nineteenth century. Important survivals include six prophets painted on the reveals of the east window (three of them seen in A-61) and plaster roundels set into the upper galleries, which depict Christ and some of the Apostles.\textsuperscript{15}

The surviving decoration shows a mix of Old and New Testament themes. These eventually became standard features of seventeenth-century schemes in England after the Civil War. Yet, this was new territory for the early Stuart age. Ricketts, Grapper and Knight wrote,

\begin{quote}
If this had been the total extent of the decoration at Hatfield, it would have appeared as a carefully thought-out attempt to revive biblical imagery (in both glass and paint) which managed to avoid direct reference to the most contentious subjects. However, the scheme also includes a series of six paintings of the scenes from the Life of Christ, which are documented as being in the chapel in 1611.”\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

This was highly unusual for Protestant chapels during the Elizabethan Age and mirrored the display of Catholic Queen Anne.

\textsuperscript{14} Annabel Ricketts, Claire Grapper, and Caroline Knight, 133.

\textsuperscript{15} Annabel Ricketts, Claire Grapper, and Caroline Knight, 133.

\textsuperscript{16} Annabel Ricketts, Claire Grapper and Caroline Knight, 133.
Curiously, and counter to Elizabethan piety, the altar table was emphasized with hangings and textiles. “At Hatfield . . . a red curtain hung behind the communion table, and the table itself was covered with a black velvet cloth embroidered with vine leaves. The pulpit and reading desk had similar black cloths embroidered with silver and gold thread.” Communion was at the very least on a par with the preaching ministry and as expressed the will of Robert Cecil. The sacraments were paramount in his last thoughts. He may be the first important nobleman to embrace what would come to be known as Arminianism or anti-Calvinism.

The Hatfield Chapel was in the vanguard of chapel design. It was designed for consecration (as it was in 1610) and therefore used not for preaching, but for Holy Communion. Everything about this chapel marks a return to ideas not seen since the days of Mary Tudor. It is more similar to Catholic chapels made during this period than any Protestant chapel of its time.

Because of the sacred nature, an assembly design was clearly inappropriate, and Robert’s scheme at Hatfield demonstrates how a high-church Protestant chapel could adopt pre-Reformation ideas to signal the arrival of a new type of Protestant space: one which emphasized the significance of the Passion and the celebration of the sacraments as well as preaching and prayer.

Robert Cecil created a space that mirrored Counter-Reformation ideology in a uniform decorative scheme. Through artworks consisting of the prophets, apostles, and patriarchs, the Cecil family gathered around the Communion table, focused on the celebration of Christ’s sacrifice in the sacrament. It was not far from Mass.

Robert Cecil is the first significant nobleman to portray a “Laudian” taste one full generation before Laud, Charles I, and Richard Neile. Pauline Croft wrote:
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17 Annabel Ricketts, Claire Grapper and Caroline Knight, 135.

18 Annabel Ricketts, Claire Grapper and Caroline Knight, 135.
It is possible to piece together a large amount of information about his [Cecil’s] spiritual development, and the evidence suggests a gradual but very significant change of outlook, from orthodox Elizabethan Protestantism to a very more complex position in which both his doctrinal and aesthetic sensibilities were moving in the direction later identified with Laudianism.”

It was also very close to Counter-Reformation Catholic tastes. This similarity was likely due to the close relationship Cecil had with prominent Catholics at court who continued to fit out Catholic chapels, though it was technically forbidden to do so. The resemblance to contemporary Counter-Reformation taste and the fitting up of Catholic chapels are remarkable regarding the Cecil chapel. Cecil’s willingness to incorporate these new ideas about chapel design paralleled the quasi-toleration that James allowed, even with the complications of the Gunpowder Plot and the Oath of Allegiance controversies. James, as noted in the discussion in Chapter 4, could always tell the difference between a Catholic who was loyal and one who was not. In his relationships, Cecil could also tell the difference.

Cecil administered a considerable degree of “de facto” tolerance to Catholics in public affairs, especially toward the end of his life. He was also equally tolerant of Catholics in his own personal life.

His closest friends were Gilbert Talbot, seventh Earl of Shrewsbury; Thomas Howard, Earl of Suffolk; and Edward Somerset, fourth Earl of Worchester. The friendship with the Shrewsburies was evident in a steady stream of letters from the early 1590s, and the correspondence reached a sad climax in 1611-12 as Gilbert and Mary Shrewsbury sent homemade remedies to their dying friend. Lady Shrewsbury was a crypto-papist, and it is apparent from the affectionate ribbing in his letters that whenever she and Salisbury met they discussed religion.20


20 Pauline Croft, 784-785.
Croft also argues that Salisbury continued to play the role of peacemaker and often showed a remarkable dexterity in religious matters. “His godly Protestant upbringing was tempered by an un-dogmatic attitude to foreign policy, together with tolerance toward individual Catholics and distaste for the harsher forms of repression against Catholics and Puritans alike.”

Cecil also criticized Henry VIII, the first “Protestant” king of England as the despoiler of monasteries. “I love not to look upon anything Henry VIII did, for he was the child of lust and man of iniquity.” This was a rather unusual viewpoint to have about the “scourge of popery,” Henry VIII.

The Hatfield House chapel then made concrete the spiritual drift that Croft and others described in Cecil’s religious preference.

Hatfield’s chapel was influential in the minds of those who wanted to impose Counter-Reformation tastes in England. The chapel at Hatfield made it into Laud’s defense at trial. Laud appealed to the notion that Cecil’s chapel, among others, was a precedent that showed that he, Laud, was no innovator. When attacked for the embellishment of the chapel at Lambeth, the archbishop pointed to “painted images . . . retained in the chapels of the Queen and many great men . . . contemporary practice . . . did neither destroy all coloured windows . . . nor abstain from putting up new, both in her and King James his time.” A further connection can be made between Laud and the Hatfield Chapel in that he employed the Hatfield glass painter Richard Bucket to repair old glass and put in new glass for Lambeth Chapel.

Richard Neile, one of Cecil’s closest associates, worked on a program of repair and improvement at Westminster Abbey at the same time Cecil was working on his chapel.

21 Pauline Croft, 786.
22 Pauline Croft, 786.
Westminster had effectively changed less than most other churches in the Elizabethan reign because of Gabriel Goodman, dean from 1561 to 1601. Goodman presided over ceremonies that retained much of the pre-Reformation character, including the use of vestments, altar cloths, altar canopies and other survivals from early Tudor times. Lancelot Andrewes held the post of dean from 1601 to 1605. Neile followed. At Westminster, Neile erected prebandal stalls to allow an uncluttered view of the heavily ornate high altar, donated new communion plates, and improved the church’s music. The erected prebandal stalls allowed for greater visibility of the celebration of Holy Communion. “As high steward of Westminster, Salisbury came into frequent business contact with Neile as dean. The program of refurbishment at the abbey could not have been carried out without Salisbury’s approval.” After its renovations, the Abbey was so “High Church” that the House of Commons refused to worship there and moved to the adjacent St. Margaret’s.

The illuminating list of Cecil’s anti-Calvinist preachers includes Lancelot Andrewes. Andrewes disliked the excessive sermonizing of the inherited Elizabethan religion. He urged reverent ceremonies, sacraments, and prayer. He was dedicated to the cycle of the church year established during Catholic times. In his sermons, Andrewes vividly evoked the physical nature
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26 Pauline Croft, 792.

of Christ’s sufferings on the cross and the sanctification of the sinner through this suffering. He seemed to reflect an almost “Ignation” (Saint Ignatius of Loyola) flair for dramatic homiletic imagery. Many parallels exist between the views of Andrewes and the late religious views of Cecil. There are clear parallels in chapel design as well. In 1619, Andrewes remodeled his London-based Winchester House Chapel. He made his own alignment with the ideas of Hooker and Cecil evident. With profound reverence for the Eucharist, he moved the altar to the east end of his chapel, raised it on a platform of three steps and created and railed off the altar area. In their approach to chapels, similarities appear in the language of Andrewes’s preaching and the language of Cecil’s will. Andrewes’s sermons emphasized the need for alms, good works, and sacramentalism, as does the Cecil will.

The chapel at Hatfield House in some ways marked a major shift in the relationship of religion and art in early modern England. It is significant in its rearrangement of doctrinal and aesthetic boundaries, which were new aesthetics in England. Englishmen were looking to the Counter-Reformation for influence and reintroduction of pre-Reformation decoration. Hatfield Chapel was a break with immediate Protestant practice. Cecil’s innovation was symptomatic of a movement to undo the artistic havoc wrought by the Reformation on England’s churches.

Robert Cecil, along with his cadre of protégés, such as Neile, Harsnett, Montaigne, and Andrewes, helped to fuel the movement of a theology of grace and doctrinal change in attitudes


with an emphasis on charity, reverent and ceremonious style of churchmanship, and a stress on
the role of prayer, public worship, and sacraments at the expense of preaching. This emphasis on
liturgy and physical structures of the church was because the structures by their use were
themselves made holy. These attitudes were certainly not Protestantism in opposition to
popery.

The chapel was not the only place religious ideas and old Catholic iconography broke into
English tastes. Religious art was found elsewhere in Hatfield. Auerbach and Adams documented
in their work, *Painting and Sculpture at Hatfield House*, an inventory of Salisbury’s collection. It
contained such religious scenes as *Christ at Emmaus*. This was a particularly Catholic theme,
with Christ recognized in the Eucharist rather than in Scripture: “He took bread, pronounced the
blessing, then broke the bread and began to distribute it to them. With that their eyes were
opened and they recognized him; whereupon he vanished from their sight” (Luke 24: 30-31). *Sir
Henry Wotton also sent The Departure of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and many other Italian
pictures*. One of the most provocative was the *Passion of Christ*, which was the most offensive
of all depictions in Protestant taste. It may have been in the chapel at one time, but that is
unclear from the inventory. By the time of his death, Robert Cecil was remarkably avant-garde in
his use of Christian imagery and was certainly a non-Calvinist. The art at Hatfield House shows
that as Cecil grew older, he acquired a remarkable appreciation for the visual aspects of the
Christian tradition.
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30 Peter Lake, “The Impact of Early Modern Protestantism,” *Journal of British Studies*,

31 Erna Auerbach and C. Kingsley Adams, *Painting and Sculpture at Hatfield House*
The choice made of chaplains of such an important aristocrat also exemplifies a change toward a Counter-Reformation view of religious sensibilities. Five of nine of his chaplains were deeply involved in the anti-Calvinist movement: Richard Neile and Samuel Harsnett, who were leading Arminians, and George Montaigne and John Bowle, who leaned in that direction. Richard Meredith, an old friend of Neile’s, preached anti-predestinarian sermons at court as early as 1606. It is clear he had a deep concern for sacraments and a fervent depiction of Christ’s bodily sacrifice, “twice explicitly described [in his will] as being for all mankind, it strikes what can only have been a consciously non-Calvinist note.” His tomb also strikes that same “note” in its obvious debt to tombs made on the continent. Nothing like it existed in England before its completion.

Cecil’s tomb (A-42), built by Colt, is a visual expression that strikes a balance between stoicism and sincere religious belief. It was an innovation in English tomb design. Colt’s only contemporary rival was Cornelius Clure, who executed the tombs for Elizabeth I and Mary Queen of Scots. Colt’s greatest patron was not James but James’s lord treasurer, Robert Cecil. Cecil advanced Colt’s career in the royal service and employed him privately. Salisbury’s tomb, erected after his death in Hatfield Parish Church (c.1614–c.1618) must rank as Colt’s masterpiece, though it probably owes much to Salisbury’s own ideas and initiative. The earl is shown recumbent on a slab of black marble supported by life-sized kneeling figures of the cardinal virtues, while below the slab is a skeleton on a rolled straw mat (A-42). It was revolutionary for England as it was not painted in bright colors or embellished with features borrowed from architecture. Instead, it depends for its effect on the character and disposition of
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the figures and on a simple contrast of black and white marbles. The white marble was Carrara,
procured at great expense from Italy by Salisbury. This work is also far from any Protestant
restraint or any “wariness” of images.

The life-sized effigy of Cecil, portrayed in full regalia as a Knight of the Garter, holds the
white staff of the Lord Treasurer in his right hand. The four cardinal virtues of Temperance,
Fortitude, Justice, and Prudence hold up the slab. Bernini often used the full-sized skeleton on
papal tombs, a common device of the late Middle Ages, revived during the Counter-Reformation
as a memento mori. In the Christian context, the memento mori acquires a moralizing purpose.
To the Christian, the prospect of death serves to emphasize the emptiness and fleetingness of
earthly pleasures, luxuries, and achievements, and thus also as an invitation to focus one’s
thoughts on the prospect of the afterlife. A biblical injunction often associated with the memento
mori in this context is In omnibus operibus tuis memorare novissima tua, et in aeternum non
peccabis (the Vulgate’s Latin rendering of Ecclesiasticus 7:40: “In all thy works be mindful of
thy last end and thou wilt never sin”). Tombs portraying this device were in fashion for the
wealthy in the sixteenth-century. Revived examples during the Counter-Reformation created a
stark reminder of the vanity of earthly riches. Cecil’s tomb was a rare example of memento mori
in English tomb art at the time.

The choice of Virtues also speaks volumes about Cecil’s duty and “works” as a Christian
servant. As one of the most powerful advisors of Elizabethan and Jacobean England, Cecil would
have “administered” or in theory should have exhibited in his office, the cardinal virtues of
Temperance, Fortitude, Justice, and Prudence. The prominent position in his monument of
devices used in tombs for Counter-Reformation pontiffs and prelates in Italy (a place with which
Cecil seemed enamored) would have reminded the inhabitants of their importance to live a life of
these virtues to receive a good judgment. On Cecil’s tomb, the virtues reminded the viewer in a hopeful way that these were attributes of the Lord Treasurer. Even in death, the tastes shared and exhibited by the Stuarts places Cecil among the avant-garde of English aristocracy.

**Mary Queen of Scots Catholic Legacy: “In My End Is My Own Beginning”**

One of the delicate situations that the early Stuarts faced was their connection to Mary Queen of Scots, a militant Catholic. If Mary had not been Catholic, there would have been no reason for her death or for the perceived or real threat felt by Elizabeth. Yet Mary did die, perhaps even had to die. Mythically, she survived for the dynasty, and her own motto was prophetic: “In my end is my own beginning.” Mary’s death launched a war between Spain and England that lasted fifteen years. The only connection for James and his successors to the English throne was through Mary; therefore, her legacy had to be cultivated carefully.

Historians have viewed her tragic end and drawn a variety of conclusions about its significance for the Stuart legacy. Within the context of Absolutism, James connected his right to rule in England by birth, not by election or parliamentary intrigue, which meant he had to defend his mother’s legacy. He could not allow for the “justice” of her execution or parliamentary power for deposition, or the rights of the nobility to choose a new monarch.

It seems likely that James could not have any real memories of his mother, though it appears that Mary’s “memory” often haunted him. Giovanni Scaramelli observed that James did not let a “day pass without lamenting that his mother’s head fell, at the third stroke, by a villainous deed, till those who, even by relationship, are stained with that blood grow fearful . . . lest their end be a bloody one.”34 James made sure that his mother’s memory was revived

---

34 Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli to the Venetian Doge and Senate (22 May 1603). *Calendar State Papers*, Venetian, X
through her grandchildren. James christened a daughter Mary in 1605 after his mother.35 In every Stuart generation, one of the daughters was christened Mary.

One portrait that embodies the duplicity of Mary’s legacy is an “imaginary” work that places Mary with her son James, Mary Queen of Scots and James VI and I (A-63) painted circa 1585. This work shows the mother and son between a hovering Scottish crown. The iconography of this painting shows James’s identification with his mother and the tension in the relationship. It portrays both sovereigns in almost identical pose, expression, and garment. Even the hand positions are the same. Mary touches her necklace and James the sword handle. The Scottish crown drifts rather diplomatically between the two to suggest that they share the crown jointly. In a real sense, mother and son are equal, almost one in this portrait. James is shown in mirror image of his mother and this portrait shows that his “power derived from re-production, literally and figuratively.”36 One cannot choose between mother or son; in fact, this portrait allows no choice. The divine right of kings, James’s political theory, is completely reliant on legitimate bloodline. The complicated and most likely illegal way that James came to the throne of Scotland, through the misfortune of his mother, presented real propaganda problems and political issues that demanded James to feign devotion to Mary. However, in his Protestant realms, Mary’s Catholicism presented him with the problem of maintaining some distance. Jayne E. Lewis explored this delicate balancing act in her study of the life and the memory of Mary Queen of Scots. Lewis wrote:

35 Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli, Calendar State Papers, Venetian, X, 155.

James even appeared to be an organic transcription of Mary’s physical and psychological selves, and thereby a living sign of the past’s haunting of the present. For one thing, James was continually depicted in terms of what had happened to him before he was born. He was known as the Scottish (later British) Solomon, an epithet more likely to invoke his mother than his own wisdom and probity: one funeral sermon pointed out that, like James, ‘King Solomon is said to be Vgentius Coram Matriae Sua, the only son of his mother’s’ and that, just as ‘Solomon began his Reign in the life of a predecessor, […] so by the Force and Compulsion of that state did our later Sovereign James.”

James and the rest of the Stuarts balanced this memory of a failed Catholic queen who was also an ancestor and their ultimate source of rule.

Mary’s memory was significant in artistic works connected to the dynasty. James had to rectify Mary’s mistreatment, her imprisonment, and her death to proclaim his right to English kingship. This rectifying was done though sculpture, painting, and literature. This was not helped by her treatment by Elizabeth or by her ignoble death. Mary’s clumsy treatment by her executioners is well documented. After her beheading, a beheading that took several strikes, she was hastily rolled in a cloth torn from a billiard table, left unburied six months, and finally buried at Peterborough Cathedral. Her grave bore the epitaph placed there by her jailers that pronounces her death a “new and unexampled kind of Tomb, wherein the Living are enclosed with the Dead.” It predicted that the same wicked sentence, which doomed Mary to a natural death, guaranteed, “all surviving kings, being made as Common people, are subjected to a civill Death.” Elizabeth took this epitaph away for obvious reasons. To kill one queen, the heir apparent, for “treason” might set a precedent for killing another if she got “out of hand.”

---


39 William Camden, 385.
for Elizabeth, Mary’s memory and death sent mixed signals. Elizabeth denied that she had really intended to have Mary executed. This is doubtful but her denial of any “real” culpability in Mary’s death was politically useful and distanced her from the nasty charge of regicide. This denial also gave James enough leeway not to invade England after the regicide of his mother.

After six months, Mary was finally interred with some dignity, and for the next twenty-five years, she was left in a relatively unmarked grave. This changed with the ascension of her son. Mary’s tomb was sumptuously made and remarkable for its time. From the ignoble burial at Peterborough, nobles took her with great honor and placed Mary at Westminster Abbey, though curiously at night. Ironically, James was not present, still distant. James could not handle death or its rituals; especially for those he loved the most. He was absent from the funeral of his beloved Prince Henry, and even from the funeral of his wife, of Queen Anne. While extolling his mother with a magnificent tomb, he still kept his distance. Cornelius Cure and William Cure the Younger sculpted this monument, which cost £1100, a huge amount (Figures 1-1, 1-2, 1-3). Six years in the making, begun in 1606, the gilt and alabaster handiwork was sumptuous. It was beautifully rendered, more so than Elizabeth’s companion piece. Four grand unicorns, the symbol of Scotland but also an iconological image connected with Christ, death, and resurrection, stand on the four corners at the top of the architrave (Figure 1-2). The unicorn present on this monument had multi-layered meaning. It was a political statement of Mary’s rank as Queen of Scotland, but also a theological statement about her ultimate victory and resurrection. Mary’s survival in memory, as well as through her child and grandchildren, was important. In particular, the alabaster cover for the sarcophagus portrays her as a sleeping, serene, saintly figure with hands in prayer.
References are given in the Old Testament in Numbers 23: 24 and 24: 8 to the unicorn, a mythical beast often portrayed as a white horse with a single horn protruding from its forehead (as portrayed on Mary’s tomb). Job and the Psalms also mention the unicorn. In ancient Christian context, as well as the Middle Ages, the unicorn was connected to Christ’s incarnation. The unicorn was portrayed throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, often having the horn dipped in water (as at the baptistry at Pisa). The dipping was to nullify the poison of sin and was especially potent in nullifying the poison from serpents. Obvious connections were made with the serpent in Genesis, and the symbol of the woman who crushed the serpent’s head found in the book of Revelations.

Catholic writers, allowing the traditionally pagan symbolism of the unicorn to become acceptable within religious doctrine, have long identified the unicorn as a symbol of Christ. Some Catholic writings interpreted the unicorn and its death as the Passion of Christ. The original myths refer to a beast with one horn that can only be tamed by a virgin maiden; subsequently, some Catholic scholars translated this into an allegory for Christ’s relationship with the Virgin Mary. The unicorns symbolized Christ’s purification of the world from sin. According to mythology, only a virgin could tame the unicorn, and it became a natural association with the Virgin Mary and the Incarnation. The unicorn was chosen as a symbol of Scotland while the country was one of the most devout adherents to Catholicism. The unicorn on Mary Queen of Scots’ tomb had a double meaning: resurrection and motherhood.⁴⁰ There are multiple layers of meaning for this tomb. Mary is the primogenitor of the dynasty, the root of the

claim of the Stuarts. With the emphasis on her motherliness, she is worthy of redemption, especially considering her status as a martyr for monarchy and her staunch and unrepentant faith.

Much of this tomb’s symbolism was read through the notion of *imprese*, which was at the height of its popularity at the end of the sixteenth-century.

An *imprese* permitted the conflation, often the equation, of classical and Christian symbolism. It enabled one to imply claims that one might hesitate to proclaim and to deliver orations with a maximum of economy and a minimum of responsibility; interpretation of the message was left to the beholder’s imagination and learning. Imprese could embody within their diminutive format extremely elaborate ideas expressed in the sparest of hieroglyphs, complicated visual and verbal puns and interplay between the two, and a polite display of erudition. The best *imprese* offered, in addition, the structural satisfaction of a well-designed building, the elegance of an aphorism, and the refinement worthy of the goldsmith. All these qualities appealed enormously to the taste of the times.41

Seeing this tomb within the realm of possibilities expressed in Renaissance notions of *imprese* allows us to value also its iconography as a statement of politics. The tomb can also be read in a theologically complex way. As well-educated Renaissance men, James and Cornelius Clure certainly would have used the design of this monument for its most far-reaching impact. Its creation was by its very nature a multi-layered, multi-purposed work that would express the importance of Mary’s life and death and her role as imperial mother. Her Catholicism could not be ignored, even if James had wanted to. Catholicism was too central to Mary’s legacy.

Of considerable importance is the presence of angels on this tomb. Historians have noted that by the end of the second decade of the 1600s, angels came into vogue in England. They fail to make the connection with the building of the Tomb of Mary Queen of Scots (Figure 1-2). This statement of the dynasty was completed and in place by 1612. The theological message was sent by the inclusion of angels on this tomb. Angels were messengers between the spiritual world and

this world. They were appropriate accessories, intermediaries between the death of this woman and the throne of God. Angels were thought to direct and speed up prayer. They were everywhere in Catholic Counter-Reformation art. Hooker and Andrewes, in preaching and devotions, wrote at great length about angels’ divine ministry.\textsuperscript{42} Laud would later include angels, especially cherubs, were a favorite Laudian accessory.

Literature of the day expressed another important reason for the construction of the tomb. James’s Roman Catholic subjects were “grieved . . . when they saw no memory at all made of so memorable a mother either in word or in work; she lying . . . obscurely in that place where her enemies cast her after cutting off her head.”\textsuperscript{43} James’s Roman Catholic favorite, the Earl of Northampton, mused and complained about her obscurity. He commented on her interment at Westminster “as dead roseleaves are preserved, whence the liqueur that makes the kingdom sweet has been distilled . . . She is buried with honor.”\textsuperscript{44} Through her physical move to London, Mary had become part of England’s body politic.

With the ascension of James to England, Mary’s image proliferated. Catholic observers reported that the minute Elizabeth was dead, Elizabeth’s “picture was hidden everywhere and Mary Stuart’s shown instead with the declaration that she suffered for no cause other than her religion.”\textsuperscript{45} Northampton hung a picture of Mary directly opposite a passion of Christ in his


\textsuperscript{44} Jayne Elizabeth Lewis, 66. Here the quotations of Northampton are found in the 10 October 1612, \textit{Calendar State Papers, Domestic}, IX, 90. Northampton’s epitaph was so fervently devoted to Mary that they recall the martyrologies of the late sixteenth-century.

\textsuperscript{45} Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli, \textit{Calendar State Papers}, Venetian, X, 9-10.
bedroom. Many sources point to the immediate proliferation of paintings of Mary Queen of Scots. One such work, which was produced by her ladies in waiting, *Mary Queen of Scots Memorial Portrait* (A-64), gives us an example of these works that emerged from the shadows in the early seventeenth-century.

The notion of the martyrdom of Mary Stuart was expressed in this portrait. Elizabeth Curle, who was in the close confidence of the queen, commissioned the portrait shortly after her death. Elizabeth was for eight years in attendance on the queen in captivity. Mary’s Catholic faith is evident in this painting. Details are borrowed from continental martyrologies, which appeared immediately after her death. Included in this painting is an execution in miniature immediately below her right arm, which holds a crucifix and Latin inscriptions, which confirm the Queen of Scots as a “true daughter” of the Roman Church. Her ladies-in-waiting are seen diminutively behind her to the left. The issue of Mary’s religion could not be ignored with so many Catholic peers prominent in James’s court, also one knew for sure at the beginning of the seventeenth-century how many Catholics remained in England.

The ambivalent gestures regarding the memory of James’s mother created tensions in these types of works. Jayne Lewis wrote, “they fuse reflexive distance and furtive intimacy—and as they betray Mary’s visceral intrusion upon a present reluctant to include her—these early memorials weave the inconsistent desires of the living into the fixed visage of the dead.”

Lewis also pointed out that

in their disregard for historical distance and in the variable boundaries that they established between a feeling subject and the object of its passion, such incoherent images capture exactly the undesirable Mary Queen of Scots who would with consequent and

---

46 Jayne Elizabeth Lewis, 66.

47 Jayne Elizabeth Lewis, 66.
eerie vitality reappear again and again throughout the reigns of James VI/I and his descendants.”

Looking at the evidence left by James and Charles, one can almost see an allegory in the relationship between Mary and the Catholic Church. At times, they both repudiated the Roman Church while negotiating with it and its supporters. Both kings initiated traditions that could be perceived as Counter-Reformation or pre-Reformation, but which certainly paralleled the Catholicism of their day. This initiation is remarkable considering that a significant number of England’s populace seemed to be heading toward a more radically Protestant religious path. At times, James and Charles even called themselves “Catholic:” As noted in earlier chapters, their like-minded clergymen such as Laud and Andrewes argued that they had the right to such a title. This attraction and repulsion concerning both Mary Queen of Scots and the Roman Church could be an entirely separate topic for research in Stuart studies.

A Convert: Ann of Denmark and Church Papists

Many of his Protestant subjects did not share James’s inclination toward toleration for Catholics. James took an independent view of the Catholic Church from many Protestant polemicists of his time. James remarked to Parliament in 1604, “I acknowledge the Romane Church to be our mother church, although defiled with some infirmities and corruptions.” The anonymous translator of Edmond Richer’s *De Ecclesiasticâ et Politica Potestate* compared the Gallican and the English Churches in the English edition that appeared in 1612. The editor noted, as with many other contemporary writers, that King James had acknowledged the Church of Rome to be “our mother church.” James proclaimed this in no less august a venue than a speech to Parliament. This can be found in “A Speech, as it was Delivered in the Vupper Hovse of the Parliament to The Lords Spiritvall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there assembled, on Mvnday the XIX. Day of March 1603. Being The First Day Of the first Parliament.” In Johann P. Sommerville’s *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, p. 139.
reality of Anne’s Catholicism, along with James’s pacific foreign policy, made it necessary for James to take a more centrist position about the validity of the Catholic Church. James even made it clear that he believed one could find salvation in the Church of Rome.

And therefore doe we iustly confesse, that many Papists, especially our forefathers, laying their onely trust vpon CHRIST and his Merits at their last breath, may be, and often times are saued; detesting in that point, and thinking the crueltie of Puritanes worthy of fire, that will admit no saluation to any Papist. I therefore thus doe conclude this point, That as vpon the one part many honest men, seduced with some errors of Popery, may yet remaine good and faithfull Subiects.”

James made a distinction between those Catholics who were quiet, well-mannered, peaceable subjects and those who were seditious and disturbers of the commonwealth. James’s foreign policy, if irenic statements are to be believed, made some kind of accommodation of Catholicism inevitable.

Though penal laws were enacted, these laws were not regularly enforced and hardly enforced at all after 1612. In fact, after 1618, no Catholics were put to death for the remainder of his reign. James left the Catholic minority at peace while their numbers modestly increased. The passivity of most of his Catholic subjects should be noted. In fact, after the Gunpowder Plot, no significant Catholic rebellions or conspiracies occurred in England. Extreme Protestantism would be the real threat to their vision of monarchy. James, as noted in his writing, and Charles, both recognized this threat.

It is difficult to demonstrate in detail how many Catholics were in England at the ascension of James. The only reliable known group studied was the aristocracy. Records for merchant or lower classes are scattered at best. Authors have gained information by studying the pressure from the central government through the enforcement of penal laws and their influence.

---

on the aristocracy. It appears that “private arrangements” between known Catholics and the
government occurred and allowed much variety in the enforcement of recusancy laws.51 This
softness on Catholicism during the second half of James’s reign and the reign of Charles is
exemplified in the number of Catholic priests in England and their ratio to the estimated Catholic
population in the 1630s. It reached a level not equaled again until the 1850s.52 This increase in
numbers--allowed church papists, those who attended Anglican services--to receive sacraments
in the Catholic rite secretly at home or discreetly in public places such as the Catholic queen’s
chapels or foreign embassies.

The resurgence of Catholicism among peers and gentry in the early Stuart era helps
explain the political fears that it evoked. The quality that separated this movement from
Protestant dissenters, especially with all Stuart queens as adherents to the Catholic faith, was its
closeness to the crown. It was also in its very nature. Roman Catholicism made demands on its
adherents. English aristocrats, as members of the political elite in England, were also, as Roman
Catholics, part of an international religion. In days when nonconformity carried some threat to
person and property, church-papist families kept the option of Catholicism alive, but still were
fearful, knowing that Protestants thought that they could be foreign agents because of their
Catholicism. Aveling, who researched the survival of Catholicism in England, wrote: “It was the

51 E. Elliot Rose, *Cases of Conscience: Alternatives Open to Recusants and Puritans under Elizabeth and James I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976). Rose examined this point on pages 111-113. Here he makes a case for local and often sporadic imposition of recusant penal laws. Local officials often considered their relationship to the gentry and granted allowances.

Church-papists who saved the Catholic community.”53 Often compliance went so far as double baptism and church marriages for Catholics even though Catholic priests opposed this.

Carolyn M. Hibbard reevaluated the pressures on Catholicism in the early Stuart period and offers some relevant conclusions:

What becomes of the traditional picture of a heroic Catholic remnant forced out of the mainstream of English life by relentless and ubiquitous legal and social pressure?...First, the pressure was intermittent and often easily evaded. Second, from the community’s point of view, the process may be seen as Bossy describes it as one of deliberate withdrawal—a series of positive and purifying decisions rather than a disordered retreat. But there is also a third perspective on separation. Viewed from Rome, or even from across the Channel, it was a rescue operation designed to yank Catholic souls from the jaws of the Protestant hell . . . In short, when lay Catholics were told they must choose, it was as often by their clergy as by their government.54

Hibbard also added:

The precise nature of Catholic persistence and separation was not, then, predetermined, but evolved gradually out of a welter of conflicting opinions among laity and clergy. If we accept this, it is easier to understand the inconsistency between the draconian anti-Catholic legislation and its lax enforcement. Few in the Protestant political classes could view long-term religious pluralism as safe or tolerable. The reiterated demands in Parliament for stricter enforcement of the recusancy laws were more that political rhetoric. At the same time, it was not a priori clear how far honest Catholic gentlemen were prepared to go in separating themselves from the rest of the community.55

A final factor added to the maintenance and slight growth in Catholicism in the early Stuart period. There seemed to be no general expectation of a bloodbath for Catholic laity as seen in


55 Caroline M. Hibbard, 19.
other Protestant areas; indeed treason legislation was rarely employed against Catholics in early Stuart England.\textsuperscript{56}

One of the reasons for their ability to move between a public and private faith was necessity. Though the Catholic clergy often demanded a recusant to renounce their political loyalty to the sovereign as ordered by the Papacy, “the great majority of English Catholics refused to make a choice and continued to live in an uneasy but sincere conflict of loyalties.”\textsuperscript{57}

The first two Stuart kings’ attitudes toward Catholicism were convoluted. The political actions of James and Charles proved to be contradictory and at cross-purposes if elimination of Catholicism in England was their goal. James, in his negotiations for a Catholic bride for Charles, allowed the future queen to bring clergy, even bishops, as part of her entourage. Charles confirmed this and extended to a Catholic bishop the tacit toleration denied to Jesuits.\textsuperscript{58} The Oath of Allegiance remained the most important focus of tension between the crown and the papacy for over 50 years. However, numerous attempts were made to find a mutually satisfactory solution. The fact that most of the Roman clergy refused the oath and that most of the laity, when pressed, took the oath, testifies to the ability of the Catholic community to survive within both identities.

\textsuperscript{56} Caroline M. Hibbard, 20. Hibbard cited the research of important scholars of Catholicism in footnote 53, page 20. During this period, authors, such as E. Elliott Rose, J. A. Hilton, and Aveling, argued that recusant trials for treason often were complicated and involved other issues besides Catholicism. They also added that even though some were convicted, they often escaped unpunished.

\textsuperscript{57} Caroline M. Hibbard, 21.

The marriage of Charles to Henrietta Maria made the Oath of Allegiance palatable for Catholics. After Charles’s marriage, France openly competed with Spain for the clientage of the English Catholics, and a significant French camp was at court. The outside influence of the continent, either French or Spanish, should not be underestimated. The Catholic gentry of England had largely rejected Catholicism’s political aspirations, but could not reject the priests themselves. Unlike English homegrown Protestant deviations from “Anglican” orthodoxy, the Catholics were dependent on the ministry of foreign-trained priests. No other English religious group was tied to an umbilical cord to the continent.\(^59\) This provided multiple umbilici for Counter-Reformation culture. Popular belief in the international power of European Catholics isolated Catholics from other nonconformists and made them peculiarly vulnerable to political hysteria in that others might deviate from the royal supremacy, however, they seldom were ferreted out for subversion or took an oath of alliance to the crown.\(^60\)

One of the important considerations often overlooked by historians is that Catholics were perhaps unique in their collective dependence on communications with Europe. They belonged to a communion, an ecclesiastical viewpoint, which was part of a world that was often wider than that of England. A pan-national approach to reconsidering the influence of Catholicism in its various forms in England helps to explain its vitality. Catholicism, when placed within the context of a peerage of twenty percent, was vital as a cultural influence during the reigns of James and Charles. English Catholicism, with its wider political context, explains the quantity and the inventories of many gentlemen and ladies’ libraries and the existence of Catholic books,


\(^{60}\) Charles I in 1639 imposed an oath on the Scots in England and Ireland who used religion as a “pretense” for rebellion. No evidence exists that any earlier oath, though it was obviously needed, was composed by James or Charles for Protestants.
paintings, and theological works, which “poured” into England through aristocratic Catholic
gentry.

The degree of Catholic influence regarding culture is now more important, according to
several recent historians. In particular, Catholic texts were produced and distributed secretly in
England or smuggled in from Europe. This literature is often unknown to historians, and only of
interest to political historians such as T. H. Clancy, who wrote *Papist Pamphleteers.*\(^{61}\) The
destruction and seizure of much of the Catholic writings and illustrated pamphlets means they
are lost to historical examination. However, Clancy’s research showed that Catholic
pamphleteers reached a peak in the 1630s.\(^{62}\) This literature was aimed not only at disputing
Protestantism, but also at keeping Catholics within the papal fold. Along with a steady influx of
pamphlets, works of art with Catholic themes were important as part of the propaganda that
steadied and maintained the old religion. Both literature and artworks fulfilled the same purpose,
keeping Catholics within their tradition. Anne of Denmark had such literature and artworks in
her possession. Her rank as queen made her the most important and influential church papist in
England.

**Anne of Denmark: Patron and Influence on Charles I**

English historiography has underappreciated Anne. Early scholars saw her as vain,
extravagant, relatively unimportant, and somewhat of an albatross for James. However, this
viewpoint is beginning to change. Recent scholarship has argued for her as an important

---

Thought of the Counter-Reformation in England 1572-1615* (Chicago: Loyola University Press,
1964).

Loyola University Press, 1974), xiv.
influence in early modern England. A more evolved view has emerged about the character of the relationship between James and his wife. Consensus has emerged that James’s relationship with Anne was affable yet often complicated. There is a paper trail of letters exchanged between them, which depict an often cordial and “newsy” liaison. James fathered nine children with her. Three survived until adulthood: Henry, Elizabeth, and Charles. However, they lived apart after the death of their final child, which indicates Anne’s reluctance to become pregnant as her health deteriorated.

The relationship of James and Anne was not an equal one in the male-dominated world of England. Yet Anne often struggled to remain within the official loop of power. She managed to make herself important and necessary in the English court by creating a “rival” to her husband’s court that was in many ways artistically superior. In fact, the center of power in England during the early reign of James was distributed between three courts: Anne (died 1619), Henry (died 1612) and James (died 1624).

It is clear that James spelled out a rigid patriarchal notion of marriage and kingship in *Basilikon Doron*. He advised his heir Prince Henry about a queen’s marital subordination and exclusion from political influence.

---

And for your behauiour to your Wife, the Scripture can best giue you counsel therein: Treat her as your owne flesh, command her as her Lord, cherish her as your helper, rule her as your pupil, and please her in all things reasonable; but teach her not to be curious in things that belong her not: You are the head, shee is your body; It is your office to command, and hers to obey; but yet with such a sweet harmonie, as shee should be as ready to obey, as ye to command; as willing to follow, as ye to go before; your loue being wholly knit vnto her, and all her affections louingly bent to follow your will.64

However, it is clear that James did not manage to impose these rather restrictive and controlling ideas on his own queen. James may have been the body’s head, but in many ways Anne was the “neck” of the body that moved the cultural head. She was also a strong voice in England on foreign policy and served as a channel for foreign embassies, particularly Catholic embassies.

From the outset of their marriage, Anne showed herself to be independent. She fostered cultural myths and practices particularly in her masques, which enhanced her own dignity and power. She was not the frivolous lightweight, as portrayed until recently by historians. Anne came from a sophisticated court. Her father, Frederic II of Denmark, was a sponsor of Tycho Brahe; her mother Sophie studied science, patronized artists and scholars, and retained some power at court during her son’s minority.65 Anne, raised to be strong and outspoken, expressed this characteristic almost immediately when she reached Scotland. From her arrival in 1589, she involved herself in political, cultural, and religious issues. In Scotland, she helped to procure the aid of Catholic Lards to come to James’s aid on more than one occasion. In Scotland, Anne converted from Lutheranism to the Roman Catholic faith. The insular parochialism and Puritanism of the Scottish Kirk did not attract Anne as a sophisticated Europeanist and conservative Lutheran. Scholars have decided Anne converted to Catholicism around the year

64 Johann P. Sommerville, 42.

1600, before James’s ascension to the English throne. Anne assured Pope Clement in 1602 that she pledged her allegiance to the Catholic faith and that James’s was fair to his Catholic subjects.

Anne involved herself immediately in the arts. This involvement was a statement of her politics and self-mythologizing. Masques, art collection, and entertainments were indications that had broader ramifications than simple amusement. Her court, though never quite an equal rival, provided an alternative center that was influential in advancing such figures as Jones, Arundel, and Buckingham. Anne’s court was important as a political channel, especially regarding the marital strategies James envisioned for their children.

Some entertainments emphasized her independent worth and importance through her family relations as a daughter of a king, sister of a king, and queen by marriage and—most importantly—as Queen Mother. This is expressed in Jonson’s “King’s Entertainment” for the coronation in London in 1604:

And here she comes that is no less a part
In this days greatness, than in my glad heart.
Glory of Queens, and glory of your Name,
Whose Graces do as far out-speak your Fame,
You Daughter, Sister, Wife of Several Kings:

Besides Allyance, and the stile of Mother,
In which one Title you drown all your other.  

66 For evidence of Anne’s Catholicism, see Albert J. Loomie, “King James I’s Catholic Consort,” *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 34 (1971): 303-316. The foundation for her conversion to Catholicism was most likely her relationship to the countess of Huntley in the early 1590s. She was a moderate, un-dogmatic Catholic who also attended Protestant services with her husband. However, according to the Venetian ambassador, she did not take communion even at her husband’s coronation in England.

Motherhood was a particularly effective arena for Anne to use her influence, and she seems to have had extensive sway in the lives of her sons and daughter. George Chapman praised Anne as the most important foundation for Prince Henry’s virtue. “Sole Empress of Beautie, and Vertue . . . With whatsoever Honor wee adorne/Your Royall Issue; wee must gratulate yow/ Imperiall Soveraigne. Who of you is borne, /Is you. One Tree, make both the Bole and Bow.” Most modern historians take the notorious lack of personal virtue of James, his homosexual dallying, and drinking as canon. Though Anne was fond of drink and the theater, she seemed to have been a more stable source of artistic patronage, virtue, and piety, perhaps in two religions. Though she never took communion in the Anglican Church, she did favor some of the greatest court preachers, such as Dunne, and attended word services often, more often than did James.

One of the poets who dedicated her works to Anne was Aemilia Layner, who constructed Anne’s persona in expansive associations. She saw Anne as the conduit and embodiment of the female virtues and powers. Layner expanded her maternal role, inviting Anne to see herself as a nurturer of artists, judge of biblical exegesis, and defender of women.

Renowned Empresse, and great Britanes Queene,  
Most gratioius Mother of succeeding Kings;  
Vouchsafe to view that which is seldome seene,  
A Woman writing of divinest things:  
From Juno you have State and Dignities,  
From warlike Pallas, Wisdome, Fortitude;  
And from faire Venus all her Excellencies,

---


With their best parts your Highnesses is indu’d:
The Muses doe attend upon your Throne,
With all the Artists at your becke and call.\(^{70}\)

This could also to a certain degree sum up Anne’s sense of self. She often resisted James’s policies and continued to work for what she thought was best for her children and England. Her strongest resistance centered on her children, the household, her Roman Catholic religion, court appointments, and theater patronage. Anne tied all these efforts together with adroit political maneuvering. She would have made a fine “Byzantine” princess.

Often Anne would insist on more control over her children than James liked. She achieved that influence on a regular basis. The well-known account of demanding the presence of Prince Henry in England before she would come to the coronation is well documented. Anne clearly won that battle.\(^{71}\) Contrary to precedence, she involved herself in her children’s lives to the point that they all had great esteem for her. Charles stayed for months with her as her health deteriorated, and the warm relationship she had with her daughter Elizabeth is documented through their correspondence. She was extremely close to Henry and much of the joy left her life when he died. In the end, only two of nine children outlived her.

Anne’s Catholicism often involved political machinations during her English period. She wrote Pope Clement VIII in 1601 and 1604 and again in 1609 regarding her status as a Catholic, and they exchanged gifts and letters at these times. The letter in 1609 regarded plans for Prince

\(^{70}\) Aemelia Lanyer, \textit{Salve deus rex iudæorum: containing, 1. The passion of Christ, 2. Eues apologie in defence of women, 3. The teares of the daughters of Ierusalem, 4. The salutation and sorrow of the Virgine Marie: with diuers other things not vnfit to be read written by Mistris Æmilia Lanyer} (London: Printed by Valentine Simmes for Richard Bonian, and are to be sold at his shop in Paules Churchyard, Anno 1611), sigs. A3-A 4.

\(^{71}\) See the description of this along with other descriptions of Anne’s ability to influence family as well as political policy in Barbara Kiefer Lewalski’s \textit{Writing Women in Jacobean England} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 20-22.
Henry to marry an Italian Catholic princess This letter suggested that it could be a way to bring England back into the Catholic fold. One of the gifts Anne accepted from the pope was a rosary. When former intelligencer Sir Anthony Standen was discovered bringing Anne the rosary from Pope Clement VIII in 1603, James imprisoned him in the tower for ten months. Anne protested her annoyance at the gift, but eventually secured Standen’s release for his kindness.72

The marriage plans for Prince Henry initially elicited support for a pro-Spanish policy and then later a pro-Medici policy from Anne. She also supported, at the same time, the notion of marriage for Princess Elizabeth to the recently widowed Phillip III of Spain and at first opposed the Protestant Elector of the Palatine. (Her judgment here was wiser than James’s, for the Elector exemplified rashness.) For more than ten years, Anne’s blatant favoring of the Spanish was a complaint that the French ambassador often expressed to James.73 Anne’s Roman Catholicism made her an independent center of intrigue at court. Native and foreign Catholic priests attended to her spiritual needs.74 Although this was an embarrassment for James at home, it was politically useful internationally. It bolstered his claim that he was “fair” to his Catholic population.

Anne’s religion was a source of Catholic influence on several levels. Anne favored entertainments that were reminiscent of the Catholic sensibilities rather than the Protestant severity found in England, especially regarding the theater. Besides importing Catholic artists and Catholic artwork, she imported Catholic books of poetry and devotions, including Dialogues


73 Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, 21.

74 Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, 21.
of S. Gregorie. Artwork, books, and other worship aids were distributed to her favorites, and James did little to stop her in these endeavors.

Anne’s choices of favorites form a list of some of the most important politicians, religious thinkers, and poets of early modern England. Toward the end of her life the Catholic Howards and their associates were promoted, however she also patronized and associated with the Essex-Sidney faction of internationalist Protestants. These Protestants were optimistic about Prince Henry’s ability as a Protestant champion in the mold of James. All these factions had one point in common: They were major patrons of literature and the arts and most of them were kin to her favorite and most influential courtier, Lucy the Countess of Bedford. However, Anne disliked Robert Carr (Somerset) and helped promote George Villiers (Buckingham), who would dominate James and Charles’s policies until Buckingham’s death in 1628. It was the promotion of Villiers that would influence both kings and shape the foreign policy that ultimately continued English dialogue with Catholic powers, though the emphasis turned from Spain to France. Villiers was no Puritan. He nearly converted to Catholicism in the early 1620s, saved by William Laud’s preaching for Anglicanism.

According to Ethel Carleton Williams, Anne became more earnest in her Catholic practice as her death approached, and kept priests at Hampton Court. She also beautifully decorated a chapel at Oatlands that was friendly to Catholic service, according to its descriptions. Jones, a gifted architect steeped in the latest European taste, designed the Queen’s House at Greenwich (Figure 5-1) for Anne. It was one of the first true Palladian buildings in England. The first

———

75 Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, 22.


floor was finished at Anne’s death. The Dutch inventor Salomon de Caus laid out her gardens at Greenwich and Somerset House. Anne also commissioned artists, such as Paul van Somer, Isaac Oliver, and Daniel Mytens, who led English taste in visual arts for a generation. Under Anne, the Royal Collection began once more to expand, a policy that continued and blossomed under Anne’s two sons Henry and Charles. Historian Alan Stewart suggested that many of the phenomena now seen as peculiarly Jacobean should be more closely associated with Anne’s patronage rather than with James, who “fell asleep during some of England’s most celebrated plays.”

Anne’s own “discreet” Catholicism seems to have been no significant handicap for James, and her broad-mindedness was a major asset. She publicly kept her own Protestant chapel with its many clever preachers, headed by the great English poets, such as the “Divine” John Donne (a former Catholic). This would be in strident contrast to the Catholicism of her son’s French wife Henrietta Maria. No evidence shows that Anne ever took communion in the English Church. Accounts of her “death bed conversion” are doubtful at best and seem to be apocryphal polemics for the Anglicans of her day.

As discussed in Chapter 4, James struggled with granting some kind of tolerance to Catholicism, and his wife must have influenced this decision. If you were a good citizen, were

---

78 Ethel Carleton Williams, 181.

79 Pauline Croft, 56.


81 Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King: A Life of James VI & I* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2003), 183. Williams also noted this tendency of James to sleep during plays and masques, p. 106.
willing to pay extra taxes, and did not plot, you could practice the old faith. In a speech before Parliament, James argued, “Force never helped in religious matters and that gallant men should not be forced to die as martyrs.” This policy of softness toward Catholicism was a problem.

James’s attempt at a limited toleration was not understood or accepted by the Pope; it would, however, remain the basis of his policy for recusants for the rest of his reign. The toleration which the Pope could not see nor understand, James’s ‘Puritan’ subjects did see, and they also could not understand it.

The marriage of religious difference may have worked in a limited way at the English court, but politicians inside and outside of England had difficulty understanding this nuanced détente of religions that James managed to create with Anne, as well as his vision of détente for both of his sons in marriage.

Anne’s attendance at her husband’s Protestant services and sermons was a form of religious dissimulation widely practiced in England and Scotland by church papists. Routine compliance with the Church of England and committed Catholicism were not always mutually exclusive. The number of Catholics who “complied” may have been far greater than previously estimated. One notes that the practice of conformity or “church papistry” was an option practiced by laity and tacitly allowed by the Catholic mission on a greater scale than the official Roman Catholic propaganda might suggest. This practice was part of the official policy of the


85 Alexandra Walsham. See Chapter 3 in her text, which displays much evidence of wide-scale church papistry in the early Stuart Age.
Scottish Jesuit mission and its superior, Robert Abercrombie. He required his priests to allow Catholics to attend Protestant sermons as a sign of conformity.86

Some scholarship has focused on the militant Protestant nature of many of Anne’s chaplains. However, Peter McCullough does not doubt her commitment to Romanism. He wrote”

To assume so [that Anne was a Protestant] requires discrediting Anne’s own professions of a Roman faith. Rather, affinity, kinship, and patronage ties often transcended religious differences between Anne and her preachers, just as they did the differences between herself and her inner circle. More importantly, the queen, like so many conforming Catholics, opted for conformity to the routine non-Eucharistic services of the [English] church instead of the staunch recusancy urged by Catholic missionary propaganda.”87

As for Anne not receiving communion publicly, McCullough wrote,

Anne’s not descending to the body of the chapel royal for communion on Christmas, Whitsun, or Easter was no proof [for Protestant observers] that she had not received a lawful communion in the seclusion of her private closet; and, of course, the privy closet would have provided the perfect place for clandestine celebration of the mass. Anne’s Catholicism, whether devout or dabbling, was a matter of private faith, and she seems to have decided early in her marriage that she would not make it a factional issue.88

Her ability to move between all religious camps likely made her an important asset for James. Ambassadors noticed Anne’s influence in politics. A Venetian ambassador described Anne as follows:

She is like a daughter, sister and wife of a king who cannot be said of any other. She claims her virtues come from God. She is patiently attached to her brother the king of Denmark. Anne also has a political mind. [According to several Venetian ambassadors] she was very anxious for the marriage to a Spanish infanta. She hates the idea of a French


88 Peter E. McCullough, 174.
marriage and opposes it openly at court speaking against even the legitimacy of the king of France. She was also a great supporter of Mr. Villiers and he depends upon her. She was well disposed to Venice.\(^{89}\)

The writings of ambassadors show considerable evidence of her importance in diplomacy as a back door channel for James because of her discreet Catholicism.

One place where Anne decidedly situated her Catholicism front and center was in art and architecture. No evidence exists of any Calvinist influence in Anne’s artistic taste. Anne was instrumental in advancing Catholic artists, poets, and architects. Some Puritans at court did not always share her enthusiasm for art. An example the much resistance to the innovations of Baroque art comes from a contemporary Calvinist writer, Richard Bernard. Bernard was a Calvinist Puritan, but a moderate one.\(^{90}\)

Bernard advocated a joyful approach to life, instead of the more strict, serious, and pious disposition that was encouraged at the time by many Puritans. However, he flirted with nonconformity with the Anglican Church when he was first preaching. He lost his job over his dissent on March 15, 1605. For a short time, he formed his own congregation of about one hundred members in 1606 in a separatist church, but then returned to his parish post in 1607. However, he still refused to make the sign of the cross during baptisms. The cross, symbolically or pictorially, was the most offensive to many English Protestants. Nonconformity led to Bernard being brought before church courts again in 1608 and 1611. Throughout most of his career,

\(^{89}\) Anne is a frequent subject of the Venetian ambassadors’ writing back to the Doge and the Parliament of Venice. She seemed to be highly respected and well thought of by several ambassadors, and they noted her friendliness to the Catholic cause. Venetian writers document this notion throughout the Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, vols. XIV-XVI.

Bernard was an example of those godly Protestants who practiced as much nonconformity as they could within the established church. They yielded to authority as necessary but willing to work with those bishops who appreciated his marked commitment to elevating the piety of parishioners through preaching and catechizing. A prolific author, Bernard, published *Contemplative pictures with wholesome precepts*. Tellingly, no “pictures” or images of any kind appear in *Contemplative pictures with wholesome precepts*, despite the title. In fact, he railed against pictorial representation of any traditional religious subjects. Bernard explained in his work which was dedicated to Lord Edmund Sheffield, knight of the Garter and Lord President of the North:

> Heere therefore (Right Honorable, Right Worshipfull,) of all these are certain pictures [mental images of Goodness, Heaven: God, the Saints or the Devil, Hell and Evil] not Popish and sensible for superstition, but mentall, for Divine contemplation whereto are added wholesome Precepts for direction after godlie meditation. God’s Picture, to behold him is so good; to admire his excellencie, to feare his Maiestie, to praise his bountie, The Diuels portraiture, that he may be seene, that is so euill, to wonder at his wickednesse, To loath his vilenesse, to detest his wretchednesse, and to beware of his deceitfulnesse. Good is set forth to behold the comelie beautie of celestial grace, to embrace it with loue.91

Bernard’s rejection of “sensible” image as Catholic is undeniable. He repudiated such images as clearly breaking the second commandment, on which Calvin placed such a distinct emphasis. For authors such as Bernard, it was impossible to differentiate between images and idols. The inability to differentiate was in stark contrast to Anne’s love of religious images and her contemporary patronage of religious painters. In reality, religious painting came into vogue at precisely the same time that Anne became Queen of England. This is likely not a coincidence.

One of the most important artists Anne first employed was Isaac Oliver. He was also the first painter to revive religious iconography in England. Born in France, Oliver moved to England in 1568 with his goldsmith father. He became a naturalized citizen in 1606. Oliver studied under Hilliard and began a rival practice to his mentor in 1590. Oliver was the only English painter of his generation from England to have traveled to Italy. He was in Venice in 1596, where he reproduced Renaissance paintings in miniatures. While Hilliard retained the attention of King James I, Oliver began working for Queen Anne and also worked for Henry, Prince of Wales. Henry began ordering commissions from him in 1604.

His thoroughly un-English miniatures of *Head of Christ* (A-65) and of *The Returned Prodigal* were for Anne. Jill Finsten’s research offered a view of Oliver’s “sophisticated internationalism” and the fine quality of his paintings. These works, intended for the Catholic Queen Anne, were “progressive and precocious.” Before his death, Oliver did drawings and painted numerous miniatures and larger paintings of religious subjects for the queen. These works in oil and pen are closer to Counter-Reformation tastes than anything else previously seen in England. More than fifty survive and are documented by Jill Finsten. Among these were *Madonna and Child in Glory* (A-66), which was inspired by Rubens’s *Madonna at Santa Maria* 

---


94 For the documentation of religious works, see Volume II of Jill Finsten, *Isaac Oliver: Art at the Courts of Elizabeth I and James*, 1981. This is the most recent complete study of Oliver and is a *catalogue raisonne* of his existing works, new attributions, and lost works.
in Valicella,\textsuperscript{95} Moses Strikes the Rock (A-67) and The Entombment (A-68), finished by Oliver’s son Peter for Charles in the 1630s. One of the most controversial paintings in Anne’s collection was titled Crucifixion. This work by Oliver (A-69) survives only as a copy by an unknown artist. Other lost large canvases included St. John the Baptist Holding a Cross and a Holy Family, described in inventories by George Vertue, an art critic of post-Restoration times.

Vertue (1684–1756) was an English engraver and antiquary, whose notebooks on British art of the first half of the 18th century are a valuable source for previous periods.\textsuperscript{96} He described these lost works of Oliver as “perfectly finished equal I think to any of those masters of that time of day.” Vertue’s opinion of the quality of Oliver’s work was highlighted by his purchase of St. John the Baptist.\textsuperscript{97}

With Oliver the official painter to Queen Anne and to Prince Henry, his works took on more value and importance as models for other artists and aristocrats. These commissioned works, especially religious works, made an impression on those allowed to see them, even if they were for personal devotion. Anne’s possession of and commissioning of religious works would have been understood as a tacit “permission” among the aristocracy for the collection and creation of such subjects.

Anne built up an excellent collection of pictures at Somerset House and Oatlands.\textsuperscript{98} Charles, as with his mother Anne, commissioned religious art not seen since the first Tudor king,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{95} Jill Finsten, vol. I, 137.
\textsuperscript{96} Jill Finsten, vol. II, 197.
\textsuperscript{97} George Vertue, “Notebooks,” in Walpole Society, quoted in Jill Finsten vol. II, page 196.
\end{flushright}
his great-great grandfather Henry VII. The Entombment (A-68) begun in 1616 by Isaac Oliver and completed by his son Peter by 1636, was one of Charles’s prized possessions and speaks of Charles’s piety as well as his sentimental connection to his mother. This piece is undoubtedly the much-prized cabinet miniature described by Van de Dort in the inventories of the collections of Charles I.\(^99\) It was left unfinished at the death of Isaac Oliver, and was originally intended for Anne of Denmark as a devotional piece. It was so well loved by Charles, no doubt because of the connection to his mother, that he gave the younger Oliver a yearly £ 200 stipend upon its completion.\(^100\) Peter Oliver used the drawing of the Lamentation Over the Dead Christ by his father (A-70) as a primary drawing for many of the figures. The Entombment shows a greater clarity of purpose and a familiarity with emerging Baroque Italian art. The purpose for this type of cabinetwork was personal devotion / private altar, akin to a book of hours used in the Middle Ages, and still in use by nobility in the contemporary Catholic world of Charles. It has already been noted in Chapter 4 that James took along such religious works as aids for prayer on trips to Scotland and on progresses. This was one of Charles’s such devotional pieces.

Works such as these, produced by both Oliver elder and younger, had Counter-Reformation stylistic quality. As noted in Chapter 2, the Council of Trent called for clarity, drama, realism, and emotion as essential qualities for effective religious works. Oliver, though a Protestant, painted with these Catholic sensibilities for a Catholic queen. His son Peter painted according to his father’s lead and his patron’s taste. This is an important example of Charles following his mother’s connoisseurship and tastes in art, particularly religious art.


\(^{100}\) Karen Hearn, 157.
With the tragic death of Prince Henry in 1612, Anne led the dynasty in advancing important cultural figures for the remainder of the decade. She was particularly influential in the advancement of Inigo Jones, who created for her the Queen’s House (Figure 5-1) in Greenwich. It was begun for Anne and--little change in design-- finished for Henrietta Maria.\footnote{Michael Leapman, Inigo: The Troubled Life of Inigo Jones, Architect of the English Renaissance (London: Review, 2003), 361.} The chapel at Greenwich, enriched by Charles with some of the finest decorative commissions from artists in Europe,\footnote{Oliver Millar, 9.} would be a point of contention for radical Protestants and Puritans and would be a place of iconoclastic destruction during the Civil War. Jones also renovated for Anne a chapel at Whitehall, which no longer exists; it was destroyed in a fire. Jones also designed the magnificent chapel (A-71) for Henrietta Maria at St. James’s Palace, with its plain exterior yet exquisite interior with vaulted and compartmented roof, like that of the Pantheon.

Anne’s last days are evocative of the closeness of Anne and Charles. James visited Anne only three times during her last illness,\footnote{Pauline Croft. King James (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003). David Harris Wilson in King James VI & I. (London: Jonathan Cape Ltd., 1963), page 100, said that James visited her twice a week until he moved to Newmarket in February; both James, through messengers, and Charles were anxious that Anne make a will. James distrusted Charles’s interest in the matter, fearing Anne might make him her only heir. Wilson, 198-200.} though Prince Charles often slept in the adjoining bedroom at Hampton Court Palace and was at her bedside during her last days, when she lost her sight.\footnote{Alan Stewart, The Cradle King: A Life of James VI & I (London: Chatto and Windus, 2003), 300.} Queen Anne died at age 44 on March 2, 1619, of a dangerous form of dropsy. Despite
his neglect of Anne, James was emotionally distraught over her death. He could not visit her during her dying days or even attend her funeral, being overwrought himself. His symptoms, according to Sir Theodore de Mayerne, included “fainting, sighing, dread, incredible sadness . . .” For all his bravado, swagger, and hunting prowess, James could not handle illness or death in those who were close to him. After a prolonged delay, Anne was finally buried in King Henry VII’s Our Lady Chapel, Westminster Abbey, on 13 May 1619. Maximilian Colt designed a magnificent temporary catafalque, placed over her grave. Unfortunately, as with so much Stuart culture, iconoclasts destroyed it during the Civil War.

Henry, Prince of Wales

The most recent and thorough treatment of the life of Henry Stuart, Prince of Wales, was written by Roy Strong. Strong lamented the loss of a possibly great king of England throughout his work and pointed to the importance of the young royal for much advancement in the arts through his short yet impressive life. Painters, architects, and designers took central stage and were respected as contributors to intellectual endeavors during the brief but influential period of Prince Henry.

Henry received an advanced classical education; he was intelligent, brave, and athletic. He established his own household in 1610 at the age of 16. He died at age 18, probably from typhoid
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105 Pauline Croft, 10. James also fell seriously ill when Prince Henry was dying. (Wilson, 285.)

106 David Harris Wilson, 403.

107 David Harris Wilson, 219.

fever. At Richmond Palace, Henry laid out elaborate gardens in the Italian style. He amassed a fine collection of works of art, including pictures, sculptures, and medals from classical antiquity and the Renaissance. He favored art from the Netherlands and Venice, on biblical or mythological themes. Henry, according to Strong, was most of all an Italophile. Henry appointed Robert Peake and Isaac Oliver as official court painter and miniaturist, respectively. Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones produced for him many elaborate Jacobean masques. These were about the promise of his future kingship, which never came to fruition.

Two Catholic courts formed the intellectual context for Henry’s collection and court composition. Roy Strong wrote that the “importance attached to artists can only be understood within a European context, and it is late Medicean Florence and Rudolfine Prague which will give us an essential point of reference. Both courts were of interest to the Prince and from both he recruited members for his own household.”109 Visual arts played a greatly enhanced role in his court. The visual characters of Catholic Florence and Prague were a break from Elizabethan and early Jacobean court practice. Neither James nor Elizabeth’s court offered the place of prestige to the artist that Henry, the Medici, or the Hapsburgs did. “Stylistically England was a backwater, for Gloriana’s reign had been a rock against change. It had almost glorified in its own insularity, producing during its last two decades a unique and archaic visual culture which had little to do with the mainstream Renaissance art.”110

Constantino de Servi was a vital link to that Renaissance mainstream as his career took him from Rome, to Florence, then Prague, and finally England.111 De Servi came to England

109 Roy Strong, 86.
110 Roy Strong, 88.
111 Roy Strong, 90-91.
with the permission of the Grand Duke of Tuscany to work initially for two years for Prince Henry in 1610. \(112\) De Servi was particularly friendly with Sir Edward Cecil, a strong promoter of a match between Prince Henry and the house of Medici. De Servi also imported some books on intermezzi, masques, and architecture from Italy, which were available to other aficionados. As a Catholic connected to both the Medici and the Hapsburgs, de Servi embodied continental tastes and iconography then in use in the areas he visited. According to Strong, artists, architects, and designers such as de Servi and Isaac Oliver, who reflected Italian, Hapsburg and French court tastes, were influences that shaped burgeoning tastes in England. Strong observed that with the death of Henry, “There can be no doubt that the course of visual arts would have run in a different way had the St. James’s court not been dissolved at the close of 1612.”\(113\)

The impact of Henry’s death in England was enormous. “Henry was often described as austere, withdrawn and slow of speech. He too was a model of Christian virtue.”\(114\) He often heard his chaplain’s sermon and then heard on the same day a sermon by one of his parents’ priests. Human emotion for him found its outlet in his devotion to his mother and above all in his passion for his sister and brother.\(115\) His relationship with Charles was strong and loving to the end. While in the process of dying, he found time to play cards with little Charles and to examine and to play with, once again, the splendid bronze figures collected from Florence at the behest of Charles.\(116\) By all accounts, Charles adored his dashing, athletic, intelligent, and impetuous
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brother, who teased him unmercifully. This only endeared him more to the future king, who named his final surviving son after him (Henry Stuart, Duke of Gloucester).

Henry, Prince of Wales emerges as one of the

Earliest instances of the spell exerted over the cold Protestant north by the warm Catholic south. Although he cast himself as a forerunner of Gustavus Adolphus, leading the troops of Protestant chivalry to victory over Catholicism and the Hapsburgs, there are elements in his make-up which recall the Swedish King’s daughter, Christina, whose surrender to the lure of the south led to the abandonment of a kingdom and her faith and the great journey to Italy.117

Roy Strong also added that one catches glimpses of the court at St. James during Henry’s brief “spring,” which resembled that of a Counter-Reformation ruler of an Italian state rather than one of a Protestant champion.118 If Henry had survived and married either Spanish or an Italian princess in 1612, Catholic influence, artistic style, or religious presence would have been in England more than a decade earlier than its appearance with the arrival of Henrietta Maria in 1625. The negotiations secured in Henry’s marriage plans were friendlier to Catholics than those upon Henrietta’s arrival, due to the Thirty Years’ War.

George Villiers: Duke of Buckingham

Another important politician, court favorite, and collector was the Duke of Buckingham, George Villiers, who rose rapidly in the court of King James. As with Arundel and Jones, Anne was the first to notice him. “In 1615 he was appointed Cupbearer; by 1618 he was Marques and in 1624 he was raised to the Dukedom. He held many of the great offices of state.”119 He built up a wonderful collection at York House in a very short period, principally with the advice and

117 Roy Strong, 221-222.

118 Roy Strong, 222.

119 Oliver Millar, 17.
help of Balthazar Gerbier. Gerbier told his patron that of all the amateurs, princes, and kings, there is not one “who has collected in forty years as many pictures as your Excellency has collected in five.”120 Buckingham loved the Venetian paintings of the sixteenth-century in which he followed the tastes of Robert Cecil and the Earl of Somerset, predecessors in James’s affections. Buckingham also helped to form young Prince Charles’s tastes in painting.121 Buckingham had Gerbier collect works in Venice, which included Titian’s Ecce Homo (A-72). By 1615, in a reversal of the Elizabethan practice, the royals and their favorites now freely collected and displayed religious art. The duke’s collection of Venetian works most likely influenced Van Dyck during his 1620-1621 visit to England, when Buckingham gave him several commissions.122 Buckingham went to Spain with Charles for the hand of the Infanta. He also acquired other religious works, like Giovanni da Bologna’s Samson and the Philistine (A-73), which is currently in the Victoria and Albert Museum.123 King Philip IV gave this religious statue to the Prince of Wales when he was visiting Spain on the quest for a Spanish Match. Charles later passed it to his traveling companion and favorite, the Duke of Buckingham, who had it shipped to England via Santander. This work portrays Samson defeating one of his philistine enemies. This masterpiece of Giambologna was the first biblically-based, life-sized statue that had been brought to and displayed in England since the beginning of the Reformation.

Many of the works collected by Buckingham were also religious in nature. As
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amassed before his tragic death, he took his place at the forefront of a group of collectors at Whitehall. One of his crowning achievements and one that led to his ultimate undoing was his elevation in military matters. He was appointed by James as Lord High Admiral in 1623 and was for all practical purposes the unnamed chief minister by the end of James’s reign. He retained this influence during the initial part of Charles’s reign. This of course invited jealousy, and after his bungled diplomatic dealings with the great powers of Europe, Buckingham led England into war. Ironically, this war was called for by popular demand through the press and was supported by Protestants as a way to right the wronged Elizabeth Stuart and the Elector Frederick, the Winter King and Queen, the central figures of the Thirty Years’ War. When battles went in favor of the Imperial or French armies, Buckingham became extremely unpopular with many in the government, but not with the king. A disgruntled military officer assassinated him in 1628. Charles was devastated and remembered him as a combination of father, brother, and saint. Queen Henrietta Maria only gained any real influence after the departure of George Villiers from the scene.

Buckingham was especially significant for his excellent collection and patronage of architecture as well as antiquities. Next to Anne, he was the second most important influence on Charles. Villiers’s collection was full of important religious artworks.

This abundance of religious images, this repetition and inescapable presence in public and private chambers alike, may be due to a variety of factors. Fashions in collecting, the hazards of availability and the vagaries of taste certainly played a role; the religious affiliations of the family may have done too, and it is possible that individual works were displayed, or hanging schemes devised, to transmit messages. The religious element in the

---

collection was well enough known to be specifically targeted by the Parliamentarians during the Civil War.125

Philip McEvansoneya suggested a significant growth in religious commissions and in the collection of religious art after 1620. He noted that “taste” for religious subjects may have developed in this period because of greater religious freedom, or as a reaction to earlier iconoclasm, and the movement of art from Italy to England was facilitated by comparative peace in the period after 1604.126 McEvansoneya’s study included the collections of the Earl of Leicester, Lord Lumley, and the Earl of Northampton, the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Arundel, and the Earl of Northumberland. One of the criteria for this study and the reason for including these patrons of the arts was their firm inventories. Buckingham’s collection had the largest group of religious works,127 and Buckingham teetered close to conversion to the Roman Church for much of this period.

The collection contained works that were most scandalous to iconoclasts and many Puritans, as they contained Christ in many subject matters and included depictions of crucifixions. Buckingham’s collection has the largest proportion of New Testament subjects, but Arundel’s collection also had large numbers of such works. To find the Virgin and Saints in these collections should not be startling, as Catholics were members of both families. To find these religious works in the other collections is rather telling. The monarchy in the early 1620s had been building Catholic chapels and renovating their own Protestant chapels, and religious
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decoration and painting was present in both. Pre-Reformation and Counter-Reformation iconography was being reflected in the collections of courtiers--Catholic and Protestant alike. The visual world was now being expressed as it had been before the Reform.

Diplomacy, Collectors, and Aristocracy

The ascension of James I to the English throne meant an influx of portraits of overseas rulers, popes, relatives, and hopeful allies. It also meant renewed ties to Europe on a scale not seen since Henry VIII and Mary I. These ties created particularly fruitful opportunities for other monarchs through their embassies sent to England. New works flooded into England from the Catholic south as gifts from these courts. One such work is a gift to James from Philip III of Spain: a portrait of his favorite daughter, the Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenie, and her Dwarf (A-74). Isabella was the ruler of the Spanish Netherlands. This type of spectacular Hapsburg portrait influenced state artwork for James and his family. The Archduchess Isabella is depicted in a magnificent pearl-encrusted gown lined with fur and embroidered with linked rings, fleurs-de-lis, anemones, and pansies. This portrait depicts Isabella in the height of Spanish fashion. The flowers portrayed also point out her impressive bloodlines—French, Spanish, and English.

The portrait of Isabella, along with other notables, such as Henri IV of France, Philip II of Spain, and his queen, were on view at Whitehall after the rapprochement with Spain began.128 Along with other such exchanges, this influx of paintings influenced the local artists and certainly would have influenced James, Charles, Anne, and Henry in a move toward the sensibilities of the south. These artworks also proclaimed an absolutist attitude.

Another work that came about due to the influx of diplomatic influence is *Anne of Denmark* (A-75). In this painting, a Roman arch figures prominently as one of the major sources of light in the background. Gheeraerts painted Anne in a dress that is as elaborate as the Archduchess’s dress. It is portrayed with embroidered flowers and peacock feathers. These “were appropriate symbols for the Queen, as this bird was sacred to Juno, wife of the King of the Roman gods, Jupiter. In Scotland, James had written a poem to Anne as ‘our earthlie Juno and our Gratious Queen.’”  

Anne wears some of the family jewelry given to her by her brother King Christian IV of Denmark, including a “C4” jewel. Suspended from her bodice is a large double cross. The Italian inscription she chose for her motto is translated as, “My Greatness comes from God.” Anne rather independently claims in this motto that her greatness comes not from her association with James alone, but from her own royal status and from her faith.

James’s outward-looking foreign policies, following the treaty of 1604, brought to an end the comparative isolation of Elizabeth’s final twenty years. This new attitude allowed more Britons to travel. Works never previously imported came into the country via the Netherlands, Italy, and even Spain. They now poured into England at an unprecedented rate. So did foreign artists. Enthusiasm for collecting works of art and antiquities was seen by the aristocracy as a mark of cultivation and political awareness. Henry Prince of Wales’s advisers inculcated in him a real enthusiasm for continental art. Anne of Denmark, the Earl and Countess of Arundel, and James’s earliest favorite, Robert Kerr, also formed collections. Other notable aristocrats were the
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Countess of Bedford, the second Marquis of Hamilton and the king’s last and undoubtedly “favorite” favorite, James Villiers. With the ephemeral masques, a traditional form of court entertainment and instruction, the amount of money spent upon the arts by these aristocrats and royals was staggering, dwarfing the investment of the Elizabethan years.

In addition, a new and robust painting class of native-born talents began to emerge with the advent of the Stuarts. As mentioned earlier, Isaac Oliver had secured the patronage of Anne. Oliver was a painter who helped to resurrect religious painting in England. No known religious painters were working in England during the reign of Elizabeth I. Another painter who contributed to the rebirth of religious painting was the English painter Rowland Buckett. He was commissioned by Robert Cecil to decorate the Hatfield House Chapel with traditional Christian themes. One such work for the chapel was Buckett’s *The Angel Appearing to the Shepherds* (A-76). Rowland Buckett also painted *Christ and the Apostles* as part of a ceiling design for Cecil’s chapel. Unfortunately, these were destroyed by a fire later in the century. However, surviving decoration shows a fixed scheme to revive religious painting in English chapels.132 This scheme includes six paintings of the life of Christ documented in the chapel by 1611. It was extraordinary for English chapels after the Reformation.133 Two of these Buckett paintings that have survived and are still at Hatfield are Buckett’s *Annunciation* and the *Angels Appearing to the Shepherds*. Hatfield House Chapel (Figures 5-2, 5-3) showed an important counter-example to the contemporaneous Protestant tastes noted in such works as the *Survey of London* and the
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starkness of the churches, built and decorated in London in the early seventeenth-century until the coming of the Laudians.

Painting re-emerged in the early Stuart period with some genuine English masters such as Oliver, who painted in the Renaissance manner. He was greatly influenced by the continent, with complicated religious and philosophical undertones. One such example is the painting of Edward Herbert, First Baron of Cherbury (A-77) in which classical detail and emphasis on Renaissance learning and poetry are exemplified. Connotations of religious traditionalism also include some medieval-revival notions of the contemplative life. Edward Herbert, the brother of George Herbert, was a philosopher an important metaphysical poet, and a diplomat. He belonged to the group of English noblemen who traveled widely in Europe. Oliver presented Herbert in the dual role of a poet/philosopher and a chivalrous knight. He rests on the ground while holding his shield.

Coupled with the shady tree and the trickling brook, contemporaries would immediately have recognized his attitude as that of the poet-philosopher. The motto on his shield, ‘Magica Sympathia’ (referring to the doctrine of sympathetic magic discussed in his philosophical treatise De Veritate) and the impresa—a heart emerging from wings or flames with sparks rising from it—continues the theme.

Strong suggested that this symbolism represented divine rays of inspiration, signifying those desires by which the reasonable soul aspires and attempts to climb to the mysteries and knowledge of the sublime. The smoke or sparks coming from the heart and fire emblem are seen as divine aid in the creative process, whereby the poets or philosophers are elevated above the common mind. The castle in the background is also part of this symbolism of divine
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What is striking is the realism of the landscape, perhaps inspired by Dutch or contemporary Italian works, emphasizing the physical beauty and elegance of the patron.

Ambassadors such as Herbert acted as art agents. They became the model for connections made in the Jacobean and Caroline courts. These ambassador/collectors facilitated the tremendous additions to the royal collections, and the collections of other prominent court figures in Jacobean England. Sir Dudley Carleton was a particularly important contact as the ambassador to Venice, another court that had strained relations with the Hapsburgs and Rome in the early seventeenth-century. By the time Carleton arrived in July 1610, it was already expected that foreign ambassadors would contract with art dealers as agents and collectors for royals and courtiers at the English court. Regrettably, the identity and the history of the paintings acquired by Carleton from his appointment to Venice from 1612 to 1622 are scant. However, it is known that he did acquire Venetian masters for the collections of Arundel, Pembroke, the second Marquis of Hamilton, and the Duke of Buckingham. Carleton regarded Arundel as the most important collector in the 1610s for gaining new acquisitions. As one of the wealthiest couples in England, the Arundels spent vast sums of money on their collections.

As with Anne of Denmark, women courtiers could also exhibit some important influence in the Jacobean and Carolinian court. The Countess of Arundel, Alatheia Talbot, was a collector and a committed Catholic. She certainly was no church papist. Countess Arundel and her
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husband often acted in official capacity as ambassadors. Her famous family provided her with many models for cultural, religious, and architectural patronage plus a vast inheritance. Bess of Hardwick, Elizabeth Hardwick, the renowned builder of Hardwick Hall, was her grandmother. Mary Cavendish Talbot was her mother who built the second court of St. John’s College, Cambridge. Alathea came from deep pockets. Lady Arundel’s wealth helped to finance the Arundels’ trip to Italy with Inigo Jones 1613 to 1614. The first major art purchases for the Arundel family date from this journey.141 Before this trip, the Arundels escorted Princess Elizabeth to Germany. Oddly, English Catholics made sure that their princess would reach the hands of the most influential Protestant prince of the time, the Elector Palatinate. James believed in détente.

Lady Arundel’s control of capital gave her a high degree of autonomy, as did her connections to Queen Anne. Her Catholicism did not seem to hamper her efforts at court until the time of the Civil War. Besides traveling to Italy, she also traveled to Spain and Antwerp, and was the initiate for the discussion for the purchase of the Gonzaga art collections in Mantua for Charles when he was still Prince of Wales.142 The Arundel house was next door to the queen’s palace, Somerset House, located between the Strand and the Thames in a grouping of mansions of many of the high-ranking nobles. Here the couple cultivated an “academy” for connoisseurs, scholars, and artists who were drawn to the famous collections of paintings, the library,
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drawings, Greek and Roman statues, gems, cameos, coins, and antique inscriptions. Arundel kept his extensive collection of drawings by such important artists as Raphael, Leonardo, and Michelangelo.

The Arundel House was on the itinerary of an extremely wide range of guests and visitors, including the papal nuncios Panzani and Conn, who seemed to be often welcomed at the villa. At least twice, the Arundels entertained Queen Henrietta Maria and King Charles I in their galleries (A-78, A-79). In Daniel Mytens’s *Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel* (Figure A-78), Arundel points to noble ancestors in the gallery. Peacock observed: “The precious antique statues, to which their noble owner points meaningfully with his staff, became a symbol of antiquity of lineage, superseding the literal narrative of a glorious ancestry made by the merely old-fashioned portraits in the lower gallery” of their manor. Howard’s traditionalism, love of antiquity, and family lineage are reflected in his collections.

The largest numbers of works on display at Howard’s sculptural gallery were of philosophers or Roman patricians or were Hellenistic copies of Greek originals. The purpose of the collection was to assist in elevating the stature of the Howard family and to show Arundel as a major collector and patron of the fine arts. Most of his collection can still be seen at Oxford University at the Ashmolean Museum. Arundel, with his austerity and grandeur, a strange
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combination, was influential with Prince Henry and was “involved with the growth of his collections: he performed in masques and was closely associated with Inigo Jones.”

Arundel was the most significant and influential patron during the time of James I. He favored Daniel Mytens as a painter during the same period as did the royal family. His status is proclaimed in Mytens’s *Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel* (A-78). Arundel is shown with a staff of office, flaunting his post as Earl Marshal. He wears the blue ribbon, Lesser George and garter of the Order of the Garter. Beyond the great arched doorway, an idealized version of his sculpture gallery is shown in the Arundel House on the Strand, which overlooked the Thames. The river is visible through the far end doorway. These sculptures are also important elements that testified to Arundel’s connoisseurship, social standing, and wealth. He was a true aristocrat and would have inherited the only surviving English dukedom, if it had not been for the “treason” of both his Catholic father and grandfather.

Though Arundel would ultimately convert to the Church of England on 25 December 1625, he was reconciled before his death to Catholicism. But his choice for religious art and his respect for his Catholic ancestry (which included a Catholic saint) never seems to have wavered. Before his Protestant conversion, Arundel as a Catholic could freely travel to Germany, France, the Low Countries, and Italy. A trip that lasted from 1613 to 1615 included Inigo Jones in his party. The beginning of this journey was an important diplomatic mission where the Arundels along with Jones helped to escort Princess Elizabeth to her husband’s principality of the Palatine. Arundel, a trusted servant, also escorted the daughter of Charles and Henrietta Maria, Princess
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Mary, to her new husband, William of Orange. Arundel spent his final years living as a Royalist exile, first in Antwerp and then in Italy.

Research by Edward Chaney suggested that little doubt that Arundel died a Roman Catholic. Once again, we have an example of fluidity in religious affiliation in early modern England. D. Jaffe wrote that Arundel’s heart was buried in the wall of St. Anthony in Padua as a symbol of his heart’s return to the old faith. Burial of one’s heart was a Catholic tradition that many, including popes, practiced during the early modern period as a supreme statement of loyalty to the church. Many of the Renaissance and Baroque popes had their hearts buried separately in St. Vincent’s near the Trevi fountain in Rome.

The Howards, during the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles, are a case study for the fluidity of religious sentiments. Philip Howard (a Catholic saint), the father of Thomas Howard, was born during the time that Philip II was King of England. King Philip II was his godfather. Baptized a Catholic, his father Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, conformed to the state religion, educated Philip partly under John Foxe, the Protestant martyrlogist, and Philip was sent to Cambridge, the strongest Protestant university in England. Philip’s wife Anne, who converted to Catholicism sometime in the 1580s, lived until 1630. Philip was executed, rather unfairly according to recent scholarship, during the hysteria of the Spanish Armada in 1588. Philip was first sentenced to a fine of 10,000 pounds and imprisoned at the queen’s pleasure. He was tried for having favored the excommunication of the queen; however, this was impossible since the
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Bull of Excommunication had never been published before his arrest. He died in the tower, and his family remained in disgrace until the Stuarts came to the throne.

The Howards continued to vacillate between Catholicism and Anglicanism. One reason that Arundel may have felt more comfortable in his conversion to the English Church in the mid-1620s was that his journey toward Anglican conversion coincided with the arrival of Archbishop De Dominis. As noted in Chapter 4, this was a period of a directional turn toward pre-Reformation and Counter-Reformation ideology for the English Church. Howard’s conversion coincided with the advancement of the Arminians and anti-Calvinists in the middle of the third decade of the seventeenth-century. As the new friendliness toward Catholic religious art and a more traditional emphasis on liturgical practice emerged in the English Church, English Protestantism was made “palatable” for Howard. It also helped him become even more indispensable to Charles.

Even though Arundel often played with political fire at court, he was a major influence on James, Anne, Henry, and Charles. The major controversy that Arundel became embroiled in with the royal family centered on his opposition, at times, to Buckingham and on his son’s ill-advised marriage to a relative of Charles I against Charles’s will. However, Arundel regained the royal family’s confidence after the death of Buckingham. Eventually, he became an ambassador to several states for Charles, including one of the most important posts, the embassy to the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II at Vienna.

Lady Arundel’s Catholicism never wavered. Her faith was proclaimed in her portrait (A-79), a counterpoint to her husband’s portrait. This painting by Mytens showed her before the portrait gallery. Instead of the marks of political power shown in her husband’s painting, she is shown with marks of piety and wealth that were appropriate for such a grand aristocratic woman.
Dressed in sober black, as her husband, she wears an obviously expensive dress. She is magnificently jeweled. The most remarkable jewelry is her diamond brooch, which forms the letters “IHS”, which she also wears in Van Dyck’s *Madagascar Portrait*. The letters “IHS” represent *Jesus Hominum Salvator*, Jesus the savior of man. This Christogram was featured in the seal of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits). Consistently used by the Jesuits throughout the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this symbol was one of their most prominent and recognized statements of militant Catholicism. “This Brooch, so prominent in her portraiture, is in keeping with her avowed Catholicism. Unlike her husband, she never became an Anglican, and embarrassed him by expressing her hopes for the re-conversion of England to Catholicism.”\(^{151}\)

Inigo Jones also featured this Christogram in a working draft for the façade of St. Paul’s Cathedral (A-80). This and other drafts are featured in discussions of the renovations of St. Paul’s in the next chapter. The IHS’s presence in proposed plans and display at court speaks of Stuart attitudes of tolerance and of Catholic influence creeping into supposedly “Protestant” design.

The picture gallery in the background of the painting of Lady Arundel is portrayed in classical idealization as in the painting of Lord Arundel’s sculpture gallery. The large paintings in uniform dark frames with gilt edges seem to have been the portraits of many Arundel and Fitzalan relatives. As was traditional in Catholic picture galleries, these ancestral paintings were placed to inspire their descendants to perform noble deeds and were also intermixed with religious works. It is impossible from the position of the paintings to determine which ancestors are placed there.
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Countess Arundel traveled with her husband to Italy and France on numerous occasions. She had impressed Queen Marie de’ Medici so much that the Queen gave her etiquette privileges normally reserved for only French Duchesses.\(^{152}\) The Countess traveled again to Venice in 1620, where she took her sons for further education. It is most likely that the group sat for a portrait by Peter Paul Rubens while they were on the trip. *Lady Arundel and Her Entourage* (A-81) contains symbolism representing and confirming her ardent Catholic faith as in her early portrait. Behind her flutters a banner with her family’s coat of arms suspended from four magnificent Solomonic columns. These columns were connected not only with wisdom but also the true religion and in particular devotion to the Eucharist. According to legends, Constantine brought back the Solomonic columns from the “Holy of Holies” that stood on the high altar of St. Peter’s in Rome, holding up the ancient baldachin. (This point will be developed in much detail in Chapter 6, which deals with Charles I and the commissions surrounding Rubens and the Banqueting House.) The dog, though maybe a family pet, also symbolizes faithfulness and nuzzles the enthroned countess gently, pointing to her as a symbol of unmovable Catholic faith.

According to Rubens, in a letter dated to 1620, he stressed the importance of the Arundels’ patronage in the early seventeenth-century. He called Lord Arundel “one of the four evangelists and a supporter of our art.”\(^{153}\) The Arundels also groomed Van Dyck as an artist for England. Van Dyck joined Alatheia in Venice sometime in the early 1620s, where they shared a taste for the paintings of Titian. In 1622, “a biography of Titian, *Breve compendio della vita del fam. Titano Vecelli de Cadore*, was dedicated to Alatheia as a liberal patron of the art of learning by

\(^{152}\) Karen Hearn, 210.

It is through Alathea that in 1623 the Grand Chancellor of Mantua made approaches to Charles I regarding the king’s possible purchase of the Mantua art collection. The Mantua Collection was the single most impressive collection Charles was to buy.

The closeness and trust the Arundels gained with the Stuarts, even with occasional problems, was emphasized by their mission to escort back to France Marie de’ Medici after the beginning of the political troubles in the late 1630s. The dowager queen had been visiting her daughter Queen Henrietta Maria in the early 1640s. Yet, religious tensions occasionally wore on the Arundels. From the time of his Anglican conversion, Arundel became more unwilling to be involved with religious issues, so that by 1637 the papal agent in England, George Conn, reported to Cardinal Francesco Barberini in Rome that Arundel “was given to pictures and statues” rather than to controversies at court.

Another painting created during this period, which emphasized some of the religious qualities and the blending of classicism due to the Arundels’ artistic influence, is *Charles I as Prince of Wales* (Figure 4-19) by Hendricks Van Steenwijk the Younger. In this work, Charles is wearing the robes of the Prince of Wales. Seated on a throne with sphinxes as armrests, holding a staff of authority, he gazes intently at the viewer. One third of the painting shows a classical interior with Doric columns on a porch that overlooks a classical piazza. Once again, a dog that might have been a household pet symbolizes the faithfulness of this future monarch. These canines were frequently put in Dutch paintings during the Renaissance as symbols of religious faith and commitment, including the renowned *Arnolfini Wedding* of Jan Van Eyck. With the influence of Buckingham and Arundel and the history of Prince Henry’s interest in classical
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architecture and Renaissance painting, it seemed Charles was destined for the great role as
initiator of a stylistic revolution. His destiny was tied to Catholic rather than Protestant tastes for
religious art and display. Absolutism in England would have a Catholic, not Protestant flavor.

**Inigo Jones as a Catholic Influence**

Without Inigo Jones, the splendors of the Stuart court would have been inconceivable. He
was England’s universal man--architect, mechanic, mathematician, artist, designer of sets
and costumes, antiquary ad connoisseur. His talents realized the architectural ambitions
and theatrical fantasies of the monarchy and of leading aristocrats from the death of
Elizabeth through to the Civil Wars, and in many ways he was responsible for the forms
that those ambitions took, for he was virtually alone in his knowledge of the modern arts
of design, and his genius was almost the sole channel by which these arts were
communicated to the British Court. In the insular world of Great Britain at the beginning
of the seventeenth-century, excluded as it was from Europe by religious differences, there
were few men who had had the opportunity of cultured travel on the continent.156

The seventeenth-century was a period of transition for English society, and the world of
architecture was no exception. At the beginning of the century, responsibility for design of
architecture lay primarily in the hands of practical men. By the end of the century, a new brand
of individual emerged: the professional architect. This development was due in great part to
Inigo Jones. Jones held the post of the Surveyor-General of the King’s Works for much of this
period. Jones was a man who was urbane and well traveled and was largely an uncompromising
Italophile. Vitruvius and Palladio were his inspiration. It was from them that Jones imported a
system of classical design in which most details were subject to the controlling mind of the
architect. Jones was no revolutionary in the political sense, and the English Civil War, thwarted
his influence. It was not until the age of Wren, precipitated by the great fire of London of 1666,
that the classical tradition took firm root in the English building world as a whole. However,
Inigo Jones had planted the seed brought back from Italy.

Jones explored the influences of Italian classicism and mannerism that were the heritage of Michelangelo and other great artists of the sixteenth-century. This Renaissance style passed through the lenses of Palladio to England through Jones. Much of his style was based on the Catholic classical humanist revival of the Italian Renaissance. Jones’s ideas came into a medieval community suspicious of the new style. This community often had a difficult time adjusting to the complicated confessional world of early seventeenth-century England. England particularly was still somewhat iconoclastic and inward looking at the ascension of James I. However, both James I and Charles I were much friendlier to the urbane continental expressions of architecture. Tapping the talent of their Surveyor of Works, the Stuart monarchy--and in particular their queen consorts--used Jones’s significant talent to advertise their power and right to rule through magnificent architecture, stages, chapels, and display. Jones helped to express England’s ever-shifting and unique brand of Christianity through chapel renovations. However, Jones used templates almost exclusively from Italian and French Catholicism, not continental Calvinist, Huguenot, or Lutheran sources.

One area of disagreement among scholars about Jones is his religious affiliation. Roy Strong, one of the most influential historians dealing with Jones and his architecture, argued: “This architectural revolution was seen as Protestant and British and that any reading of it by way of Italianate crypto-Catholicism is wholly wrong.” He based this on the fact that Jones was, in his view, a staunch Puritan and therefore a discernable “Anglican” and “Protestant” character appeared in the works he designed and created. Other scholarship challenges this notion, and the testimony of John Webb disputed this notion. Webb, Jones’s closest associate, friend, and figurative “son” testified that he lived and died a Catholic.
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What is indisputable is that Jones came from a Catholic family. Though he was from an affluent merchant class family, Jones never attended university. One of his earliest biographers, Alan Cunningham, suggested his Catholicism was the reason he did not attend college in England during the eclipse of the Elizabethan age. Attendance at a university in England during this period would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a Roman Catholic. This is also the view of Jones’s most important twentieth-century biographer, J. Alfred Gotch. In addition, The Dictionary of National Biography confidently claimed that Jones and his father were Catholics. His associations also testify to this statement.

Jones was extremely friendly in his youth with “notorious” and unapologetic Catholics such as Edmund Bolton and Tobie Matthew, converts to the faith as young men who both stubbornly refused to abandon it. He also had a long and intense friendship with the Earl of Arundel, Thomas Howard, initiated long before Howard’s conversion to Anglicanism. If Jones was Catholic, much of Strong’s argument for interpreting Jones’s architecture as an expression of Jones’s militant and innovative “Protestant” architecture is wrong. Jones as a Roman Catholic also helps to explain his extremely close association with Queen Anne, who was his first important royal patron, and the particularly “chummy” relationship Jones had with Henrietta Maria, as well as with the other Catholic artists who worked for and with him on many of the important projects of the regime. His silence on religious matters also argues for Romanism. If he were indeed a committed Puritan, no evidence has been found in his own words. In fact, the military junta persecuted him for his “assumed” Catholicism.

Strong’s only “important” evidence for Jones’s Protestantism is a note in which Gregorio Panzani, the pope’s legate in London, described Jones in a dispatch as “Puritanisssimo Fiero.” However, that phrase need not be taken too literally. Panzani clearly disliked Inigo’s proud manner and may have been using the word as a generalized term for abuser, in the same sense as a contemporary writer, Barnaby Rich, who described somebody as a “puritan, a precise fool, not fit to hold a gentleman company.” More than likely, Inigo belonged to the group whose members did not declare their religious affiliations publicly, especially if they wanted to remain popular and employed at a court of diverse religious affiliations and divisions.

Jones spent his youth in Italy learning his artistic trade and traveling rather than at school in England. Vicenza, Rome, and Naples laid their ancient glories before Jones with Palladio as the guide. “Inigo” is an English corruption of “Ignatius,” which certainly ties him to the Counter-Reformation saint; he may have visited Spain around the turn of the seventeenth-century. With the ancient buildings and newly created splendors of the Counter-Reformation laid before him, it is no wonder that Jones’s architectural treatises and works are a reflection of
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the works of Palladio, the theory of Vitruvius, and the contemporary and ancient art he saw in his multiple visits to Italy. These informed his natural talent for moderate innovation in design.

Jones traveled extensively with Catholic families, such as the Howards, during his second visit to Europe. This party included cosmopolitan Catholics, such as Arundel’s cousin Robert Cransfield, Thomas Coke, a great favorite of Lady Arundel’s father, and Lord Shrewsbury.163 “From Vicenza, where the Arundel Party stayed for a few days, and the study of Palladio’s own interpretation of classical architecture, it was for Jones an obvious step to the antique remains in Rome.”164 Michael Leapman traced his itinerary (A-82). Again, Jones saw the wonders of the newly constructed Jesuit Churches, IL Gesu (Figure 5-2), San Ambrogio in Genoa (A-83), and the almost-finished St. Peters and the Lateran Palace (A-5).

The Lateran Palace was an important influence and inspiration for the Banqueting House. Immediately upon his election, Sixtus V employed the architect Domenico Fontana, who was engaged in alterations to the basilica at the same time, to remake the Lateran Palace. Fontana’s strong restrained style was influenced by Giacomo Vignola and modeled upon Palazzo Farnese for its regular and harmonious façade. His sound engineering basis and power of coordinating a complicated architectural program on a tightly constrained site, which Sixtus urged forward at top speed, were remarkable. A notice on 29 August 1589 announced that the work was finished: “A great palace in Piazza Lateranese has been brought to completion by Sixtus V.”165 Fontana reapplied motifs of the Lateran Palace (A-5) to other papal works in Rome. The importance of
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this renewed edifice to Jones’s designs is especially evident when it is compared to the Banqueting House.

Jones also devoured the antiquity he saw in Italy. On his last visit to Italy with the Arundels, Jones recorded the itinerary. They stopped in every major cultural center.\textsuperscript{166} This relationship between the Earl of Arundel and Jones is extremely important for their contributions to classical art and architecture in England and must be emphasized, as well as Arundel’s connection to the Catholic Church until 1625.\textsuperscript{167} Jones, as a member of a Catholic party, was able to move about Italy freely. He saw classical churches, such as the \textit{Temple Minerva} in Assisi, re-dedicated to the Virgin Mary in 1539 (Figure 4-2). The classicism and the splendid portico of the Saint Mary of the Martyrs and the Pantheon (Figure 4-1) certainly would have been on his itinerary. In Rome, Jones visited the \textit{Temple of Antoninus and Faustina}. This was an ancient temple in Rome adapted into the church of San Lorenzo in Miranda. The remains of the temple, converted into a church in the seventh or eighth century, explains its splendid conservation. The Baroque pediment behind the colonnade dates to the late sixteenth–early seventeenth centuries. This temple lies in the Forum Romanum, on the Via Sacra, opposite the Regia. The ten monolithic Corinthian columns of its pronaos are seventeen meters tall and are likely the inspiration for the porch portion for the renovations of St. Paul’s in London (Figure 5-22). The


\textsuperscript{167} Jonathan Brown, 18. Arundel’s father Philip, a Catholic, differed with Queen Elizabeth and was sentenced to life imprisonment in the Tower of London. Arundel was deprived of a father and raised in a household of most modest means. The Howards were one of the most important English Catholic families of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Arundel left England during the Civil War and reconverted to Catholicism.
roof for the portico of the temple had been removed by that time, thus taking on the appearance of a porch.

The notion of turning classical architecture into churches had a profound effect on Jones. Jones commented on such churches at great length as he annotated the texts he brought along with him on his Italian trips. Jones annotated the reproduction of the Temple of Castor and Pollux (A-53) in his copy of Palladio’s *Quattro Libri*. The Spanish-dominated city of Naples seems to have had a profound consequence, along with the Church of S. Paolo Maggiore (Temple of Castor and Pollux), in his tour of 1614. He stayed in Naples an unusual amount of time with his patrons, the Arundels. Before the earthquake of 1688, which severely damaged the church, it looked like a Roman temple. Jones, having visited the converted church at least three times, noted it in his copy of *Quattro Libri* as “one of the Best things that I have seen.”

Monumental sculpture, like that added to the porch of St. Paul, was inspired by Jones’s Italian visits. Chaney wrote: “When Jones thought of monumental sculpture placed on pedestals above a classical pediment, he thought of the Temple of Castor and Pollux in Naples.” This is surely true; however, this would not have been the only source for Jones. The popes by this time had managed to surmount most pre-Christian monuments with statues of Christ or the saints in Rome. Decoration with monumental sculpture on and in churches was common by the time Jones visited Italy. Traveling with a Catholic party gave him free rein to visit such newly created spaces. Reflected in his work and designs was the fusion of antiquity and Renaissance
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architecture in his application to the architectural problems of his day in domestic, public, and religious themes.  

**Italian Sources Reflected in the Banqueting House**

In early seventeenth-century England, many of the proponents of architectural classicism used the forms of “inevitability and antiquity to promote its significance, using the vocabulary associated with masculine values.” Christy Anderson argued that a small but important group of members of court attributed these values to classicism. This was true despite the widespread preferences of patrons, architects, and the public in general for the more traditional architecture that was based on the Gothic or native forms that existed in early modern England. Among these important individuals were both James and Charles. Anderson argued that classical and Latin architectural forms in the minds of these individuals, including the kings, helped to attach England to the continent, to its history and importantly to the Roman roots of England. It was also an expression of a “masculine” architecture and a more “catholic” and universal expression of England’s place in the universe. The commitment to classical architecture and art helped to encourage and celebrate the reputation of England as an independent kingdom, and showed that it was not provincial but connected and equal to the great cultures of Europe. Building was an effort to enhance the reputation of the early Stuart princes abroad as well as at home.
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The conscious use of classical motifs says something about the use of a masculine architecture as the choice for the Stuart dynasty versus the more feminine—light and airy—decorative Gothic. It is important to note that the previous dynasty ended with a feminine punctuation, an heirless Elizabeth. Jones made specific connections between the masculine and classical architecture in a note written after he returned from his second trip to Italy:

As in designed first on Studies the partes of the boddy of man [male gender] as eyees noses mouthes Eares and so the rest to bee parcticke in the partes sepperate ear on comm. To put them toggethear to maak a hole figure and cloath yet and consequently a hole Storry with all ye ornamentes. 174

It has long been noted that the male body was the template for early modern architectural design. This is something that was commonly connected with the resurgence of classical architecture since Leon Battista Alberti’s treatises on architecture received its wide printing. Jones had Alberti’s treatises in his collection. 175

The introduction of this style met with opposition. The Banqueting House and the façade of St. Paul’s was not a popular “innovation” for Londoners. The choice of the site for Charles I’s execution—directly in front of the Banqueting House—is noteworthy. The choice of this site for regicide makes a statement against the lofty ideology of kingship the complex symbolized. Note that this building was not used until the return of the dynasty eleven years later. No greater renunciation of James and Charles’s espousal of the new style and their views on divine right could be made than the execution of Charles in front of Jones’s architectural masterpiece with its

174 Christy Anderson. (Anderson used as her source for this insight Inigo Jones, Roman Sketchbook. Fol. 76v. Now in the Devonshire Collection, Chatsworth. John Peacock cites and discussed this passage in Harris and Higgott, Inigo Jones, p. 285.)
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semi-religious interior decorations about absolute monarchy. This building was unique in
London at this time.

The Banqueting House, Whitehall, (Figure 4-3) is one of those architectural masterworks
that hold a special place in English art and cultural history. It marks a complete change in taste
and begins a distinct phase of English architectural history. Joan Sumner Smith summed up the
importance of the Banqueting House.

The result of the enlightened patronage of Whitehall in the early years of the seventeenth-
century is a reminder of the brilliant gathering of writers, artists, and *cognoscenti* in the
Stuart court, and in its incompleteness as the interrupted scheme for a huge palace by the
sudden ending of that life with the outbreak of Civil War.¹⁷⁶

At the center of Stuart court life was the masque. The Tudor break with the papacy and
most of Catholic Europe had--until the early seventeenth-century--cut England off from some of
the principal examples of the Italian arts. However, literature had not suffered in a similar
way.¹⁷⁷ Jones used much of the great literature of Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, and others for some
of his inspiration. Many of the plays and masques were set either in antiquity or in Renaissance
Italy. With the destruction of the first Banqueting House (of a Gothic design) by a fire in 1619, it
was natural to set up the stages and the great Banqueting House with a classical style in mind.
This was an appropriate setting for masques in which court and king took an active part. The
masques performed in this period had more classical themes than ever before. They were
“reshaped and polished in the brilliance of Jonson’s language, and [were] partly novel with new

¹⁷⁶ Joan Sumner Smith, 200.
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devices of a visual nature for which the King’s Surveyor was responsible.” However, little was truly innovative about the design of the Banqueting House.

Jones’s trips to Italy were important not only from an architectural point of view, but also for what he learned about theater and art collecting from several important Italian courts. His travels included Mantua and Florence in the middle of the second decade of the seventeenth-century, where he saw elaborate performances of pageantry. These types of performances were displayed in similar grand setting back in England in the Banqueting House five years later. It is obvious that these Catholic courts had influence in the direction that Jones’s architecture took. The sumptuous pageantry witnessed in these important courts had a profound influence on him as one accustomed to the “make-shifts of the Elizabethan stage.” From these influences, Jones introduced classically designed court scenery. He provided England for the first time the proscenium arch, movable scenery, settings, and costumes from the Italian stage.

For the House of Stuart, the Banqueting House was not just for idle play or redundant ceremony.

The importance of the Banqueting House in Stuart affairs cannot be overstated. Although today it sits modestly in Whitehall, overshadowed by monumental buildings of a later age, it was then the very nucleus of royal activity; what St. Paul’s and the Houses of Parliament were to Church and State, so the Banqueting House was to Monarchy.

---

178 Joan Sumner Smith, 203.
179 Joan Sumner Smith, 203.
180 Joan Sumner Smith, 207.
181 Joan Sumner Smith, 207.
182 Graham Parry, 153.
Graham Parry noted that the rebuilding of the Banqueting House was not only necessary, but also crucial:

When it [the Banqueting House] burnt down in January 1619, its rebuilding was imperative, for it was the King's hall of state, his audience chamber and his place of judgment; the masques were held here, as was that ceremony that testified to the King's divinity, the Service of Healing. Banqueting was the least of its functions. The need for a new hall provided Jones with the opportunity to give permanent expression to those monarchical qualities, which hitherto had been much proclaimed but only transiently displayed. This *Banqueting House* would definitively establish James I as an Augustus exercising imperial sway, as a Solomon presiding in judgment; it would be a symbol of his peace and of the harmony of his rule, and it would be the Temple of the Stuart Kings. Inigo Jones therefore planned a Roman basilica, which carried imperial, judicial and religious associations, and based his design on a scheme in Vitruvius modified by Palladio’s. The interior is a gigantic double cube, 110 feet by 55, but that stark fact cannot convey the nobility of these dimensions or the grandeur that radiates from the immaculately controlled order of the parts. Jones transformed the traditional apse of the basilica into a great coffered niche where the King sat in majesty, somewhat in the fashion which Rubens portrayed in the painting on the ceiling above.  

Political and dynastic reasons were also apparent for the importance and the grandeur of the Banqueting House. The speed with which the Banqueting House was rebuilt after the fire underscores the urgency with which James viewed this project. Per Palme was the first to suggest that the major reason for the speed of the project was an alliance with Spain and the marriage of a Spanish princess to Charles. These events were ways to place James in the center of European affairs with allegiances to both Catholic and Protestant powers.  
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“Grandfather to Europe” would place him front and center to broker peace between warring churches.

As noted in previous chapters, James wished to place his court and an equal in the mainstream of politics and culture alongside the Catholic absolutists. The emphasis on majesty and display of monarchical power was reflected in Rome as well as London. One of the most celebrated works in Rome which Jones would have seen on trips, as well as through the engravings, was the renewed Lateran Palace begun by Sixtus V and finished by the summer of 1589 (A-5). If one looks closely at the Banqueting House and this edifice, the first two registers’ window designs are inverted in the plan of the Banqueting House. The only significant design change by Jones was the regularly spaced Iconic and Corinthian columns. The window treatments themselves at Whitehall are almost identical to the papal palace.

One other building of note for inspiration of the Banqueting House was St. Peter’s Basilica in Rome. Carlo Maderno designed this façade. Here Jones repeated some of the design, though slightly modified in his *Elevation of the Penultimate Design of the Banqueting House* (A-84). Looking closely at the central portion of the façade of St. Peter’s (figure 5-3) and this design for the Banqueting House, the similarities are striking. Though Jones divided his building into two registers, the basic structure of engaged columns with a pediment are extremely similar. Jones was obviously indebted to this church for some of his ideas. Even the angels holding the papal cartouche in the pediment sculpture of St. Peter’s was imitated in Jones’s design.

The 1622 Banqueting House at Whitehall, with its masterful double-cube interior (Figure 5-4), astounded most everyone in its classical beauty. It makes the same proclamation about the position and power of the Stuarts as divine-right monarchs just as St. Peter’s, on a grander scale,
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makes a statement about the papacy. The Banqueting House was a complete innovation for Londoners, who were accustomed to the warren-like Elizabethan apartments of the surrounding Whitehall Palace. With its rhythmic subtly articulated marble façade, the Banqueting House clashed with the eclectic and Gothic-inspired exteriors of neighboring buildings. Jones’s innovations were foreign and idiosyncratic. Contemporary English architects hesitated for years before adopting his methods and the Baroque style. Today, as in Jones’s time, the full nature of his new classicism has yet to be completely understood. Jones’s syncretism of architecture, animated by both literature and previous architecture, responded to antique and Italian Renaissance prototypes, and provided a philosophically tempered aesthetic standard. Catholic Italy, however, was his major source. Rome was the center of influence.

The interior of the building was a new and novel work in England. The Banqueting House, which was the site for the Stuart masques, great plays, and liturgies to extol the virtue of the monarchy, made a masque a combination of a ball, an amateur theatrical, a liturgy, a play and a fancy dress party. However, the purpose of the Stuart masque was certainly not only for entertainment. The rationale was to demonstrate the Stuart concept of kingship and to deliver messages about royal authority. Almost every masque demonstrated that this authority came from God. These masques were also about the responsibility and privileges that came with being part of the aristocracy. This building emphasized the Great Chain of Being. Puritan critics of the regime frowned upon masques. They also criticized the “foreignness” of the new building.

This building was not the last of this type proposed by the dynasty. However, the most important aspect that kept Jones and the Stuarts from being major building rivals to European royalty was not the lack of scope or planning, but the lack of funds. Jones designed a proposed new Star Chamber along with extensive additions and reworking at the Palace at Whitehall. Had
it not been for his financial and political troubles, the cultured Charles would have furthered the employment of his Master of Works, Jones. “But for these factors we might have had a Royal Palace in Westminster which would have rivaled the Louvre and the Escorial.”\footnote{Ramsey Stanley, \textit{Inigo Jones} (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1924), 27.} Jones was inextricably connected with the Stuart building program to his own detriment during the English Civil War. The disapproval of Jones and his building can be seen in his rough treatment by the Long Parliament. They fined him some 1000 pounds as a mark of their displeasure with his Catholicism and his inability to distance himself from the Stuart regime.\footnote{Ramsey Stanley, 27.} He was lucky to escape with only the fine and very few future commissions after Charles’s fall.

**Sculptural Designs by Jones**

As noted earlier in this chapter, considerable relaxation arose in the use of Catholic themes in art previously out of style or even attacked during the intermittent iconoclastic events of the Elizabethan period. Often art was destroyed in churches and the Elizabethan Coat of Arms was painted over medieval masterpieces. The Crucifixion was particularly targeted, and other scenes of religious expression were not exempt. One such example of this common practice was at St. Margaret’s Church, Tivetshall (A-85). Placed above the altar area of the church in the Middle Ages was a \textit{Last Judgment}. The destruction of Christian art had tacit royal approval here. Even royal tombs and art were not immune to those attacks during the reign of James’s predecessor.\footnote{See Chapter 3 of Ramsey Stanley’s \textit{Inigo Jones}.} However, an appreciation for previously attacked Christian art began rather abruptly during the reign of James, and Jones was a prime contributor to this shift. A prime example of this stylistic change, though never completed as Jones first envisioned the tomb, was the design for the \textit{Tomb}
of Lady Cotton at St. Chad’s (A-86). This small drawing is the only example that still exists of
Jones’s designs for monumental tombs. It was not the only tomb designed by him. He had plans
for a tomb for James and for Prince Henry, but time and money saw these projects left unfinished
and the mockups for the tombs no longer exist. In Lady Cotton’s tomb (A-86), Jones envisioned
a beautifully Baroque work with angels holding the family emblem. It owes its design to earlier
Counter-Reformation examples of tomb construction. Prominently displayed are putti, a
hallmark of Jesuit Baroque works in Italy, France, and Spain during the Counter-Reformation
period.

Jones’s tomb design commemorated Lady Cotton, who died in childbirth in 1606. The
shroud covers Lady Cotton’s legs and begins to slip off her body. The classical type of
sarcophagus would have been unlike anything else constructed in the England of that period. Also in attendance were two beautifully posed and classic angels. Behind the angels are columns
that frame the outer regions of the proposed tomb. In addition, common conventions of Italianate
tombs were the harpy and heavy fruit swags. These were unknown in English tomb chests until
this time; therefore, Jones must have brought this idea with him from Italy.

Angels were not decorative on the continent. They provided an imprimatur, a sign that
God’s action was here through his mediators and messengers, the angels. The columns also are
an implied symbol of the church triumphant in this period.

John Newman has shown that these almost certainly represent the two pillars Joachim and
Boaz, which stood in the porch of the Temple of Solomon (II Kings, 7: 15-22). In the
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early seventeenth-century the Temple was equated with the Church of Christ, so in this context they would signify that the lady [Lady Cotton] had entered Heaven.”

Jones showed Lady Cotton semi-reclining, as if rising from her sleep. The cartouche directly above Lady Cotton’s figure holds a poem that suggests resurrection. The plaque reads that she “resigned Her mortall weedes” and “finds eternitye.” Tombs in post-Reformation England rarely portrayed any overt signs of election or of resurrection in Elizabethan works. Jones turned to an “engraving by Angelo Falcone of the Tomb of a Young Man, after a design by Parmigianino” for his design and inspiration. Catholic tombs are the major source for this work and the plan was only minimally changed. No attempt to “Protestantise” its designs occurred.

Another sculptural work--and one of the most important examples of how Counter-Reformation Papal Rome influenced Jones--is his design for the Catafalque for James I (A-6). James died at Theobalds on March 27, 1625. The catafalque is a decorated platform on which a coffin rests in state during a funeral for viewing the body of a monarch. It was a standard sculptural form used during the Renaissance and Baroque for monarch and pope alike. This hearse carried twelve statues of Virtues in mourning, eight around the drum and four at the angles of the podium. The French sculptor, Hubert Le Sueur, executed these in plaster of Paris. Unfortunately, they were destroyed during the Civil War. The inspiration for Jones’s design is noted by John Peacock. Peacock argued that papal presidents directly inspired Jones, especially the catafalque for Paul V Borghese and the catafalque for Sixtus V (A-7). Jones’s design “draws on a recent tradition of Tempietto-catafalques, and is particularly close to that designed

192 John Harris and Gordon Higgott, Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings, 42.
193 John Harris and Gordon Higgott, 44.
by Domenico Fontana in 1591 for the obsequies of Sixtus V.”\textsuperscript{195} Also of significance is this Tempietto type, which was a kind of a “funerary monument, since it commemorates the martyrdom of St. Peter.”\textsuperscript{196}

Jones certainly would have seen this famous chapel, the Tempietto, on his visit to Rome. He also had texts explaining the practice of using this type of monument for commanding funerals. This text was the \textit{De Rebus Praeclare Gestis a Sixto V}, authored by Bordino and presented to Jones by Edmund Bolton.\textsuperscript{197} \textit{De Rebus Praeclare Gestis a Sixto V} touted the considerable works achieved by Sixtus in his reign. The theme of papal self-glorification, through both of the catafalques produced for these pontiffs, dominated this text and similar ones that were easily available at the time. Bordino’s book helped to inform Jones on designs for the catafalque of James and the celebration of James’s allegorical achievements, displayed on the catafalque. Jones transformed this monument to his sovereign into a classical understanding of the achievements or the theoretical achievements of the king’s reign, just as Bramante had in his Tempietto for Julius II, Sergio Venture for Paul V, and Fontana for Sixtus V.

Jones simplified the Italian works he used as templates into their more classical elements. However, Jones’s drawing copied the statuary on these monuments faithfully. He even kept Religion and Justice (portrayed in Figure 2-7) in the same place as on the Fontana catafalque. John Williams, in his sermon \textit{Great Britain’s Salomon}, identified the four statues standing
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around the catafalque as Religion, Justice, War and Peace. This is very similar to Baldo Catani’s explanation of the iconography of Sixtus V’s catafalque.

Baldo Catani, the author of Sixtus V’s funeral book, explains the concetto of the catafalque: it is a work of architecture in itself whose crowning storey either incorporates or refers to all the celebrated architectural projects undertaken by the Pope and Fontana: so it incorporates the dome of St. Peter’s which Sixtus completed, the columns of Trajan and Antoninus which he restored, and the four obelisks which he erected; and it carries pictures of the Lateran Palace, the Sistine Chapel in St. Maria Maggiore, and other works.”

James’s catafalque had to be more abstract. His only major architectural achievement was the Banqueting House. Nevertheless, the ideological comparisons to Solomon and the Virtues could be repeated in relation to James.

Jones did alter the statuary slightly. Religion in the Catholic monument holds a crucifix, books, and a church, while Jones’s statue carries an altar with a flame upon it, a well-known symbol of religion used by Catholics. The use of the same symbol was a sign that James and the popes were defenders of true religion in their respective denominations. This flaming altar will also be seen in the Banqueting House ceiling (Figure 5-5, detail, Apotheosis of James I) and in other works by Rubens including Louis XIII Comes of Age (A-87), done earlier for Marie d’Medici. As we have seen from the evidence offered in this chapter, the catafalque of James is another example of the artistic influence of the Catholic south on Protestant England.
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Figure 5-1. Inigo Jones, *Queen’s House*, Greenwich. Photo by author.
Figure 5-2. *Il Gesù*. Completion in 1577. Note the prominent IHS monogram above the central door. Photo by author.
Figure 5-3. Carlo Maderno. Façade of St. Peter’s Basilica. Photo by author.
Figure 5-4. Interior Banqueting House. Photo by author.
Figure 5-5. Peter Paul Rubens, Detail, *Apotheosis of James I*, Banqueting House Cycle, photo author. Here we see the allegory of religion, which holds a flaming altar directly to the back and right of the King. Photo by author.
CHAPTER 6
THE MOVEMENT TOWARD CATHOLIC ART AND ICONOGRAPHY IN THE EARLY
REIGN OF CHARLES I

James Howell,

The weather was suitable to the condition wherein he finds the kingdom, which is cloudy; for his is left engaged in a war with a potent Prince, the People by long Desuetude unapt for Arms, the Fleet-Royal in quarter Repair, himself without a Queen, his Sister without a Country, the Crown pitifully laden with Debts and the Purse of the State lightly balusted.

Epistolae Ho Eliannae, the entrance of Charles into London to become king.

Introduction

Not all was so gloomy. Charles I was the most important constructor of Image that English royalty had ever produced. As with his father, Charles actively looked to engage the rest of Europe—Catholic or Protestant. Though Charles was seen, until recently, as inept at politics, Kevin Sharpe argued that the policies enacted during his years of personal rule were quite efficient and overall it was a time of prosperity and peace.¹ Charles’s vision was essentially the same as his father’s. At the center of Stuart policy was détente with the rest of Christianity. Perhaps even the creation of a greater “catholic” church in which the Catholic Church of Rome and the English Church could reside.

The most important “bargaining chip” Rome could have offered was some kind of autonomy, some form of direct political control of the English Church. Spain, France, and Venice, while remaining Catholic, had achieved some local control of the church. In addition, new autonomous Eastern Rites had achieved union with Rome while keeping local control. Unfortunately, Vatican diplomats never made this kind of offer.

However, the relationship between England and the papacy warmed up considerably in the 1620s and 1630s. Charles used this to his advantage to amass the greatest collection of art that England would ever see. This chapter will further explore the Catholic iconography in purchased and created works during the rule of Charles I. It will note the importance of like-minded clergymen in this program. The importance of Henrietta Maria and other Catholic influences are also presented. This chapter will include evidence for more Catholic iconography in the Banqueting House, evidence not considered by most previous scholarship.

**The Divines of Charles I and Their Agenda**

In Stuart England, the church was extremely important as a wing in the king’s plan for governance. After 1618, James gradually planned for the renewed care of the church and its buildings. Charles implemented the plans when he became king. These buildings and decorations were in themselves controversial. John Morrill argued that by the 1630s men cared more about their religion than any other subject. But disagreement arose about what was considered true Christianity, as evidenced by Morrill’s study of pamphlets and a war of words preceding the Civil War.² These pamphlets were directed often to freedom of worship and religion. More often than not, they accused contemporary high churchmen of “popery.” King James and his family were not immune. In particular, Queen Henrietta Maria was under attack. However, this did not detour the High Church faction of the Caroline period.

One of the key figures who called for the artistic renewal of the English Church, along with the churches’ decoration, was Lancelot Andrewes. Though Andrewes died as Charles assumed the “imperial” throne of Great Britain, he continued to be one of the most important religious influences through the publication of his preaching and spiritual writings. Andrewes was one of the most significant figures in the promotion of like-minded clergy and bishops, especially after he became Dean of Winsor in 1618.

Andrewes was a prelate who started his career with moderate reformed views. However, his religious view grew into a great appreciation of the early church and its Catholic medieval heritage. It “is almost axiomatic that the later years of James’s reign were a time of relative peace and quiet for Catholics. In fact, the extant narratives of the later Jacobean period do not mention English Catholics much, even while James’s projects for a Catholic marriage for Prince Charles were causing all sorts of political difficulties for the Crown.”

This was the period of Andrewes’s most “Catholic” thought, and he became increasingly important at court. An example of his importance was that James called for his old friend upon his deathbed; Andrewes, however, was too sick to travel.

Andrewes’s love of the ancient church and his particularly conservative viewpoints lent itself to the program of Charles and his Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud. Archbishop Laud used many of Andrewes’s sermons with a High-Church agenda in mind. They made especially good propaganda for the beatification of the English Churches and conservative Counter-Reformation liturgies. Changes in the English Church’s polity made infinite sense to
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Laud and to the new king, who looked toward Baroque Europe for inspiration. Both were impressed with the sacredness of the Tridentine mass and the order of Catholicism.

The splendid worship offered in the Catholic countries, the gains made by France on the mainland, and more consistent arguments that the English Church was a true part of a greater “catholic” church tradition, helped form some of the ideas at the center of Charles’s ecclesial movement. Charles and his bishops emphasized a convention of worship that gave an illusion of religious connection with the greatest powers of the continent; France, Spain, and Austria. Bishop Neile, another important Counter-Reformation Protestant, was effective in clerical patronage and managed to advance a whole group of clerics as bishops. The Durham House group, which included such notables as Matthew Wren, Laud, Andrewes, and many others, were disposed to a theological position that had more in common with Roman Catholicism than with Calvinist Protestantism.

An illustration of this movements “propaganda” was Laud’s circulation of the sermons of Lancelot Andrewes in forms that fit the Laudian program of liturgical, patristic, and ecumenical council-based Christianity. These attitudes connected the Laudian movement with traditions that predated Reformation ideology and theology. The Laudians’ vision of church agreed with the rhetoric of Andrewes contained in XCVI sermons, published in the late 1620s and 1630s. This allowed Laud to skillfully choose Andrewes’s sermons as “proof-texts” for rolling back the Reformation in certain areas. These homilies

included parochial sermons ‘Of the Worshiping of Imaginations,’ a trenchant critique of the idols of Puritanism, ‘Of the Power of Absolution,’ often cited in the 1630s for its sacerdotalism and endorsement of auricular confession, ‘Of Iustification in Christ’s Name,’ a careful engagement with Bellarmine on justification sola fide, ‘Of the giving
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Caesar his due,’ a forthright defense of subsidies and ‘Of the doing of the Word,’ one of Andrewes’s most scathing attacks on sermon-centered piety.”  

McCullough noted that Laud and Buckeridge set up the presentation of Andrewes’s sermons to mirror the works of early church fathers. One of the most noted fathers in Andrewes’s homilies, even though he was a pope, was Gregory the Great, whose ninety-six sermons were presented in a collection. Gregory the Great was the first to defend images against the criticism of his day. He argued that images were orthodox and legal. Gregory maintained that images were essential in the education and edification of the church members, an obvious fact that Laud, Buckeridge, and Andrewes also endorsed, as well as Charles. It is at the very least a remarkable coincidence that Laud and Buckeridge, acting as the “official” publishers of Andrewes’s works, settled on the exact same number of sermons included in this edition, ninety-six, as in Gregory the Great’s set of sermons.  

The majority of the sermons in Laud’s edition of Andrewes’s homilies are set to liturgical feasts, just as Gregory’s epistles and sermons were. These sermons insisted on the importance of outward observance of religious customs in the cycle of feasts and fasts. Clearly, the Church of England, was shaped in the 1620s and 1630s, to look more and more like the church that the “godly” saw as the “Whore of Babylon,”--Rome.

Evidence suggests that ministers, such as Alexander Read and Bishop Robert Skinner, (the bishop of Bristol), used this work just as Laud and Buckeridge intended. Skinner would go so far as to suggest a reading list of orthodox works for his clergy. “Read and Skinner were fulfilling
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Laud and Buckeridge’s stated hopes for public use of *XCVI sermons*. The Andrewes sermons were to serve a pedagogical function as models for imitation by the nation’s preachers.”⁹ This was an act of “canonization,” nicely captured not only in Bishop Skinner’s reading list, but also by Charles I’s commendation of three books to his children on the eve of his execution: Hooker’s *Laws*, Laud’s *Conference with Fisher*, and Andrewes’s *XCVI sermons*.¹⁰ Though Charles allowed Laud’s head to fall, by his recommendation of Laud’s works at his own end, it appears that Charles was repentant over the death of his old friend and co-religionist.

McCullough wrote: “The endorsement of authors that ‘smell of the lamp of Antiquity’ articulated a crucial aspect of Andrewes’s thought that became a ground-base of Laudian churchmanship: the concern to limit interpretation of both God’s word and the church’s laws to a highly educated ecclesiastical elite whose own guides were patristic divinity and church custom.”¹¹ Other preachers at the time who took the Laudian tack were Thomas Lawrence, master of Balliol College, Oxford, and Edward Boughen, a rector in Kent. Both presciently realized that a completely “free” laity would be the undoing of any real “church” in England. They recognized the threat that sectarianism posed to the Crown and to the church.

Boughen preached a sermon in 1630 at Paul’s Cross, a site that would be a center of iconoclasm during the Civil War. This sermon stated:

> We must not presently appeal to the Scriptures, nor make our tryall by them…since in and by them onely the victory will bee none, or very uncertain. . . . there be many in the world,
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⁹ Peter McCullough, 415.

¹⁰ *Reliquiae sacrae Carolina. Or the works of that great monarch and glorious martyr King Charles the I. Collected together, and digested in order, according to their several subjects, civil and sacred. The contents appear in the ensuing pages* (Hague and London: Printed by Samuel Browne for R. Royston, 1657), 88.

¹¹ Peter McCullough, 416.
that never saluted either University, and have no tongue, but what their mothers taught them, that hold the Scripture every man's professionally. But this is well known to be the Anabapitsticall tenet, and is the way to banish all learning out of the Church.”

Conservative religion began to doubt a church built on *Sola Scriptura* without reasoned learning and tradition.

**The Development of a Ceremonial Royal Religion**

Historians credit or demonize Charles for the Arminian “takeover” of the Church of England. However much of the rise of the Arminian party must be credited to James I. Whatever his own personal opinions were about religion, it is undisputable that James was favorable to the Arminian party at the end of his reign. The anti-Calvinists and Arminians were useful because they were proponents of strong monarchical government. James first appointed these anti-Calvinists and Charles elevated them. Peter Sharpe argued that Charles took the words and the writings of James I literally, even though this text was from the literary tradition of the *speculum principis*. “James left the *Basilikon Doron* as ‘my testament’ and ‘your counselor,’ urging his son to keep it by him as had Alexander the *Iliad* of Homer.” In *Basilikon Doron*, James “enjoins the prince to be a ‘loving nourishing father to the Church,’ to be a benefactor to the ministry and to punish the enemies of the church—the Puritans—‘in case they
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12 Edward Boughen, *Tvvo sermons the first, preached at Canterbury, at the visitation of the Lord Archbishops peculiars, in Saint Margarets Church, April 14, 1635: the second, preached at Saint Paul’s Crosse, the eighteenth of April, 1630 / by Edward Boughen* (London: Printed by R.B., 1635), 25-27.

13 For this opinion, look to Nicholas Tyack, Conrad Russell, and Peter White.


refuse to obey the law.\p16 Charles took this admonition to heart as his demand for church discipline. Charles supported bishops, such as the Archbishop of York, Matthew Wren, who praised Charles as a protector of the church.\p17 In his own writings, Charles continued this theme of fatherly advice to his son: “The chiefest duty of a King is to maintain the true religion.”\p18 Basilikon Doron also called upon Charles to fulfill his obligation to work for God’s cause.\p19 For all their differences in style--Charles a strict and reserved man and James an open and bawdy fellow--Charles often followed his father’s advice in the words and works James left to him to complete.\p20 The influence of his father is expressed in Charles’s championing of Absolutism as expressed throughout Basilikon Doron.

As the initial theological underpinning of English reform, Calvinism guided and instructed much of the iconoclasm of Henry, the extremity of the iconoclasm of Edward VI, and the periodic destruction of religious images in the Elizabethan age. English Protestantism, until the Stuarts, had a mistrust of images. As the Church of England moved between two poles, Calvin’s view of Protestantism and its pre-Reformation “Catholic” tradition, anti-Calvinists and Arminians like Laud tapped into earlier currents of thought. They contemporaneously, along with Roman Catholics, expressed evolving currents about images and ceremony. These bishops laid claim to the pre-Reformation political influence and sacerdotal office that the clergy had

\p16 Kevin Sharpe, “Private Conscience . . . .” 645.

\p17 Kevin Sharpe, “Private Conscience . . . .” 645.

\p18 J. O. Halliwell-Phillips, Letters of the Kings of England, now first collected from the originals in royal archives, and from other authentic sources, private as well as public (London, H. Colburn, 1846) vol. 2, 417.

\p19 Johann Sommerville, Basilikon Doron, 54.

\p20 Kevin Sharpe, “Private Conscience . . . .” 647.
enjoyed during the Catholic period. Theological currents like these aligned the direction of the English Church under Charles and his chosen religious leaders toward Catholic “aesthetics” in use and taste in art and architecture. Late Jacobean and Caroline prelates supported a program that would dignify churches again with proper decoration, including religious statuary and paintings of religious scenes.

These attitudes were completely contrary to a Puritan understanding of the use of art. Articles of Indictment were laid before the Archbishop of York against six “learned clerks of the cathedral church of Durham” because of their popery.

Inveigled and begiled, by your popish baits and allurements of glorious pictures, and Babalonish vesturs, and excessive number of wax-candles burning at one tyme, and especially the horrible profanation of both the sacraments with all manner of musick, both instrumentall and vocall, so loved that the Ministers could not be heard, what they said, as if Becchanalia, the feasts of Bacchus, or the AEgiptians Isis, or the Phrygian Cybele, cum multiloris tibias, et crepitanibus sistris; with fluits, and bag-pipes; with tymbrells and tabors, and not the Death and Passion of our Saviour Christ were celebrated.21

At the heart of these accusations was John Cosin, then canon, and later bishop of Durham after the Restoration. On ordination, Cosin was secretary to Bishop Overall of Litchfield, and then chaplain to Richard Neile, Bishop of Durham. In 1627, Cosin published a Collection of Private Devotions. It was prepared at the command of Charles for the use of Queen Henrietta Maria’s maids of honor. This book, along with his insistence on ritual in the cathedral church and his friendship with William Laud, exposed Cosin to the hostility of the Puritans.

Collections of Private Devotions was criticized by William Prynne and Henry Burton for its “popery.” In 1628, Cosin took part in the prosecution of a prebendary, Peter Smart, for a

sermon Smart preached against high-church practices. Smart was deprived of his benefices. Smart took his revenge at the beginning of the Civil War and petitioned for redress. In early 1641, Cosin was sequestered from his benefices. Articles of impeachment were presented against him two months later for sending the university plate to the king in support of the royal cause.

The treatment of Cosin is a prime example of the hostility the Laudian liturgical movement drew from Puritans and other dissenters. Arminians and anti-Calvinists like Andrewes, Laud, Wren, Cosin, King Charles, and other like-minded clergy and bishops attempted what some historians have called the “Arminian Counter-Reformation.” They were at the center of a movement that thought the Reformation had gone too far. The Arminians and conservatives differed from the Puritans in the essential “quality” of the church: Where is the church located? What were its historical roots? How does one express faith? How should the power of the church be expressed in society in general? They thought that the church should be part of the state apparatus, as the Stuarts and other contemporary thinkers did, and as did many Catholic anti-Machiavellians.

Basic theological disagreements between the Puritans and conservative Arminians and anti-Calvinists were central in disagreements about the use of art to express religious and religiously political concepts. Could creative effort reflect and join in creation in the works of art done to image the spiritual world? Could art be used to show the relationship between divine kingship and those who were governed? The answer to these questions for Charles, the

22 Graham Parry, *The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation: Glory, Laud and Honour* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2006). Parry’s theme was the zeal with which Laudians sought to create an appropriately splendid setting in which to worship God. For the anti-Calvinists, the Puritans were wrong to have swept away the material magnificence of the medieval English Church in the mistaken belief that they were cleansing it of pernicious popery. Also, for the notion of an Arminian Counter-Reformation, see Hugh Trevor-Roper’s *From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution.*
Arminians, and anti-Calvinists was a resounding yes. Most Puritans (with a few exceptions) would answer no, as had Calvin.

For anti-Calvinists, the “form” of the church was essential. Bishops, the Eucharist, sacraments, art, music, and celebration were as important in this Counter-Reformation mindset as scripture. If the church was to be of service to the state, then order, obedience to authority, and conforming to the “legal” and spiritual norms of the church were paramount. This form of church was rejected as unacceptable to Puritanism as only “half-reformed” or worse, veiled popery.

The power of the Puritan religion lay in its spiritual emphasis and the Bible. The inner man was what it sought. It was about the recovery and recognition of God’s Elect, not about an outward observance of ritual or of conformity. Radical Puritans and even many conforming Calvinists saw high-church qualities as worldly at best or popery at worst. The rituals and even the remaining sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist had no power to save or truly produce any real change in the believer. Election was solely a gift. Calvinism, with its essential importance on the preaching of the word, was in direct competition with the more conservative philosophy that once again argued for outward observance. Arminianism argued for care of the dilapidated churches, for a beauty in worship, and a sincere love of the created “material” order. Celebration, in its fullest meaning, described the essence of the Arminian and anti-Calvinist viewpoint while reluctance or reservation was the view of Calvinism.

The Calvinist grip on the church for most of James’s reign resulted in Arminians defining themselves against Calvinism. This redefinition led to frequent confrontations over ceremonies and clerical vestments, as well as church decoration and ecclesial government. The Archbishop of York, Richard Neile, and Laud began to make significant changes by moving communion
tables back to altar positions, introducing decorative sacramental props, such as communion chalices, at St. John’s College, Oxford, and adding previously out-of-favor Christian art.  

Re-legitimization of religious imagery in England mirrored the powerful Catholic Counter-Reformation tide. But Puritans assiduously avoided images. Diaries, pamphlets, and sermons rarely included visual detail, and meditation on images was anathema in Puritan circles. The Catholic Church actively encouraged the development of images as aids to piety, religious growth, and right rule. Laud, in a similar way, argued that the sensual experience could play an essential role in the conversion of the soul and the reception of grace.

Nobility began to build chapels with this in mind. Lord Maynart at Easton Lodge built a chapel with a glass picture of Christ’s crucifixion. In addition, as noted in the previous chapter, such notables as Lord Cecil built chapels that could easily accommodate the needs of a Catholic mass. Spiritual symbolism began to reappear in public locations, such as tombs, parish churches, and chapels. Arminianism’s aesthetics moved into the universities, demonstrated by sermons, such as one preached by William Lucy at Cambridge in 1622. Lucy championed these anti-Calvinist ideas.

A second impetus for the conservative movement by Charles and Laud had an important rationale, Christian unity, as reflected in their interest in one of the great dreams of James I. For Charles and Laud, history, precedent, and church discipline were the logical path to any real
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25 Nicholas Tyacke, 46-47.
Christian unity. W. J. Tighe noted in his study that Laud’s own “condition” for a true church had to be one with an apostolic succession, not an evangelical one. In other words, most Protestant churches were not “true” churches in Laud’s view unless legitimate bishops were installed and ruling these churches. Lack of bishops would explain why Laud did not work harder for union with the Dutch, Germans, and others who had abandoned the traditional episcopate. They were more open to the Swedish Lutherans and Galician Catholics who, in his view, maintained a true episcopal succession.26

Charles demonstrated his conservative empathy with anti-Calvinism well before his accession to the throne. The demise of Calvinism as the central polity in the English Church was predictable with the promotion of men such as Wren and Laud. Mathew Wren and other Arminians accompanied Charles to Spain for his marriage negotiations in 1623. Charles elevated Wren. Charles chose Laud to preach at the opening of Parliament in 1625 and 1626. Laud drew up the coronation service in February 1626. According to Tyacke and Lockyer, the main Calvinist element was excluded from most of the committees appointed early on in Charles’s reign because Archbishop Abbot was virtually cut off from ecclesiastical jurisdiction in 1627.27 Charles perceived the Calvinists as obstructionists to his religious and political policies.

The Stuart vision of kingship and Arminianism’s Counter-Reformation attitude suited one another. Charles’s support of the ecclesiastical innovation of Laud and Laud’s active defense of divine-right kingship were symbiotic. The idea that royal prerogative was derived from eternal principles was supported mainly by anti-Calvinists. Absolutism’s ecclesial supporters dismissed
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as blasphemous arguments that kingship was purely historical rather than divinely inspired. This attitude served both James and Charles’s purposes.\textsuperscript{28} Smuts wrote:

> In the 1620s and 1630s, the court’s Arminian theology and sensual approach to religious mysteries began to color the political theology of loyalist clergy, who treated the king, in a very literal way, as the living image of God on earth. The splendor of his court, the reverence accorded him, and the majesty of his authority all became part of a distinctive spirituality.”\textsuperscript{29}

James himself had once said before parliament that “Kings are justly called Gods for they exercise a manner of resemblance of Divine power upon earth: if you will consider the attributes to God, you shall see how they agree in the person of a king.”\textsuperscript{30} The Stuarts used art to explain the relationship between the ruler and the divine already expressed in language.

Contemporary churchmen, including many of the bishops, including Matthew Wren, preached sermons that emphasized the lofty status of the monarchy. “If any man say I fear God and feareth not the King, he is a liar. . . . It is impossible for him that feareth not the King, whom he hath seen, to fear God, whom he hath not seen. . . . Because the Image of God…is upon Kings.”\textsuperscript{31} It was not difficult for Charles to take such preaching seriously. He welcomed such rhetoric, and interpreted it by having it rendered in painting, sculpture, and building to glorify his own majesty, as well as his divine wife. Under Charles, the power of kings and visual splendor became almost indistinguishable.


\textsuperscript{29} R. Malcolm Smuts, 230.


\textsuperscript{31} Matthew Wren, \textit{A Sermon Preached Before His Majesty} (Cambridge, 1627), p. 25, cited by R. Malcolm Smuts, 325.
For a time, Catholicism in England was to benefit from the conservative nature of Laudianism. Catholics feared a clampdown on their religious freedoms because of the initial policies of Charles during the influence of Buckingham. But they indeed prospered as attitudes toward Spain relaxed around 1630. Even during the initial war-like qualities of the Caroline period with its initial zest for Protestant zeal in the Thirty Years War, Charles appointed Catholics and crypto-Catholics to power. This lax attitude toward Catholicism fueled Calvinist suspicions of a Catholic conspiracy, especially with increased toleration of Catholics, which was a hallmark of his reign.32 Francis Cottington was an example of this attitude. He was secretary to Charles as Prince of Wales and later was the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Cottington was sympathetic to Catholic activity at court.33 Henrietta Maria also proved central to Catholic court activity by including a Catholic ecclesiastical hierarchy with a Catholic bishop. By the 1630s, Catholicism had become fashionable at court. So was the pope’s envoy. Not since the days of Mary Tudor had a papal envoy been so welcome at an English court.34

The attitude of Charles on art, church polity, and royal pretensions also facilitated Catholic influence. As with James, Charles also hoped for the reunion of churches. Some of the most important bishops and clergy of the court openly preached for reconciliation with Catholicism. Laud and Wren introduced Catholic devotional practices into the Chapel Royal. Fears were elevated among many committed Calvinists that the king would convert.


Many feared that Charles would follow the path of the French King Henry IV, conversion to Rome. Marie de’ Medici, Henry’s wife, helped to stabilize his conversion. English Protestant fears centered on Marie’s daughter, Henrietta Maria and the obvious pressure she maintained toward that end. In this framework of quasi-toleration of Catholic art, ritual, and attitudes, one can easily understand the Calvinists’ distress. The Stuarts’ religious policy gave signals that were confusing to many. Calvinists who did not accept the Stuart notion of the union of politics and religion saw popery afoot. This was one of the rallying cries expressed by the parliamentarians in the Civil War. The art commissioned by Charles was even more proof for their fears.

### Henrietta Maria’s Artistic Influence on Charles I

Charles loved everything Italian, especially his half-Italian wife. His relationship with his wife was used to advantage by those around him to gain favor through gifts of Italian artworks. Those who treated the queen well gained access to Charles through her. The queen, as a devout Roman Catholic, was naturally fond of paintings, but especially of religious paintings. She was involved in establishing in London most major artists connected to the regime, including Van Dyck, Rubens, Orazio Gentileschi, and his daughter Artemisia.\(^{35}\) Henrietta Maria was familiar with Gentileschi because he worked for her mother in Paris for two years.\(^{36}\)

In 1626, the Pisan-born painter and major international figure, Orazio Gentileschi, came to London. Gentileschi was one of the major interpreters of Caravaggio’s style of tenebrism. His painting, *The Finding of Moses* (A-88), was another of the religious works commissioned by
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\(^{36}\) Oliver Millar, 60.
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Charles. Guido Reni, who merged the Baroque with Baroque Classicism, influenced it. It is a prime example of the Catholic aesthetic in religious-themed art at the court. This work shows the drama of the discovery of Moses by the daughter of the king of Egypt. The figures, bathed in light, are in stark contrast to a dark and subdued background. This muted tenebrism allows for a more emotional rendition, clarity, and illumination of the story. Besides religious commissions for the king, Gentileschi was one of the major history painters to be employed. His daughter also became involved in these history paintings and allegories.

By 1638, Artemisia was in residence at the court of Charles and Henrietta Maria. Artemisia served the king for two or three years, and for the first time in seventeen years, she worked with her father. She was in England to collaborate with her father in painting the ceiling of Queen’s House at Greenwich. The Gentileschi duo painted *Allegory of Peace and the Arts under the English Crown* (A-89) to express Charles’s patronage and “control” of the arts during his reign. The arts come alive as classical muses in this allegory, each with responsibility for their own discipline. The royal couple continued to press for more Italian works.

**Papal Flirtation with England**

When Maffeo Barberini was elected Pope Urban VIII in 1623, and after Charles’s marriage to Henrietta Maria two years later, efforts were made by Cardinal Francesco Barberini, the pope’s nephew, to charm England back into the Catholic fold. Negotiations were carried out by the papal agent in London under the auspices of conversations about art and the exchange of presents of pictures and other import artifacts from Italy. Eventually this diplomacy led to gifts from the papacy. One of the most famous groups of paintings exchanged was “A group of pictures, which was sent to the king and queen in 1635, [including] works by Albani, Turchi,
Stella and possibly Romanelli.”38 Such exchanges of culture and artworks delighted Charles. Subtle “negotiations” as these were to make England friendlier toward Catholicism.

The attitude toward the old religion was softening. Charles’s “tolerance” of the queen allowed her to install a fully developed Baroque setting for the mass for the first time in England in the late 1620s. This influenced and reinforced the Arminian drift toward Catholic ideals in the English Church. Catholic artwork was displayed blatanty in chapels and royal residences for the first time since Mary Tudor. Cardinal Barberini helped Henrietta Maria receive religious commissions from Guido Reni. Barberini also authorized Bernini to carve the magnificent marble bust of Charles to the queen and king’s delight.39 These fruitful, cordial connections between Whitehall and the Vatican were important factors in the broadsheet attacks of Puritans such as William Prynne.

William Prynne (1600-1669) was a seventeenth-century English author, polemicist, and political figure. He was a prominent Puritan opponent of the church policy of William Laud. As with many Puritans, he was strongly opposed to stage plays and he included in his Histriomastix (1632) a denunciation of actresses. This was widely seen as an attack on Queen Henrietta Maria. Prynne also verbally attacked the papal nuncio for his attempts to corrupt the chief men at court and to seduce the king himself with pictures, antiquities, images, and other vanities brought from Rome.40 The Star Chamber in 1633 tried Prynne and sentenced him to imprisonment, a £ 5000 fine, and the removal of parts of his ears. He continued his activities from prison.

38 Oliver Millar, 60.

39 Oliver Millar, 60.

In 1637, Prynne and cohorts John Bastwick and Henry Burton were sentenced to have their ears removed. They were branded with the letters “S L” (seditious libeller). Prynne wrote that in fact these letters stood for *stigmata Laudis* (marks of Laud). Released by the Long Parliament in 1640, Prynne was one of the major initiators of the parliamentary cause in the Civil War. He oversaw the trial of William Laud, which eventually ended in Laud’s execution. In the rapidly shifting climate of opinion of the time, Prynne, was at the forefront of radical opposition. He found himself a conservative figure, defending Presbyterianism against the Independents favored by Oliver Cromwell and the army. He fell from favor and was expelled from Parliament in 1648 during Pride’s Purge.

Prynne and others detested Henrietta Maria for achieving a greater place for the arts in English life, for her moderating effect on Charles, and particularly for her Catholicism. This moderation was exemplified in one the most important policies for Charles in the late 1620s, peace with Spain. On June 6, 1629, Peter Paul Rubens attended an audience at the queen’s residence at Greenwich with Charles. At this Catholic site with a Catholic envoy, negotiations were made easier. Charles used the queen’s residences to meet Catholic diplomats in a “friendlier” atmosphere.

Charles used his wife’s Catholicism as a means to help smooth relationships with the ambassador of Archduchess Isabella and her nephew, the King of Spain. Rubens, the astute diplomat, and Charles, who preferred peace to war as his father had, successfully negotiated a treaty within a few months. The peace was proclaimed on 15 December 1629. “In the patent which Charles I sent over to Rubens he praised his skill in restoring good understanding between
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the two kingdoms”\(^{42}\) and at Whitehall on March 3, 1630, the king knighted Rubens. With peace restored between England and Spain, Rubens was available to work on the most important Stuart propaganda piece, the Banqueting House ceiling. This project was suggested to Rubens in the early 1620s. However, with the conflict existing then between Rubens’s masters and the English, this project had not been possible.

One of the most hospitable atmospheres for visiting Catholic delegations were the three chapels given to Henrietta Maria for her personal use and for her entourage. Court members saw the queen’s increasing influence, which may explain the number of important Catholic converts from the aristocracy during 1630s. In addition, the obvious conservative movement of the English Church was to blame for the fuzzy lines between confessions at court. Charles and Laud were most assuredly supporters of the English Church, but they consistently moved it toward Catholic imagery in art and ceremony. This movement was counter to what was occurring in most Protestant churches outside of England.

Protestantism continued to move in a different direction in Europe. It downplayed the importance of art, clergy, order, and obedience to superiors, as England moved in the opposite direction. Many Protestants were concerned with the recent gains Catholicism had made in France, Poland, and parts of southern Germany, and Eastern Europe. To some, it looked as if England was readied once again (as it had during the time of Mary Tudor) for a radical religious shift back to Rome. The great fanfare and money spent on Henrietta’s chapels seemed to confirm this shift. In addition, the change in the Chapel Royal gave this impression.

\(^{42}\) Oliver Millar, 37.
Historians have recognized the central importance of the Chapel Royal as a template for the Church of England. From 1619 until the death of Charles in 1649, James and Charles developed the chapel architecturally and liturgically according to a vision of ceremonious Anglicanism. These changes became confused and entwined with the liturgical and architectural changes championed by a Catholic queen consort. “In the minds of the godly opponents of the Stuart regime, royal chapels thus became a powerful symbol of popery and target for destruction.” From 1619 until the end of Charles’s personal rule, there was a not so subtle change occurred in the structure and functions of the Chapel Royal, such as the reordering of ecclesiastical space, the so-called “beauty of Holiness.” Liturgy and musical settings were integrated into the functions surrounding the monarchy. Royal Deans, beginning with Lancelot Andrewes, began a series of changes. The capital also was being ordered and beautified.

Though the beautification in London started by James may have been due to the desire to present a splendid front for the intended marriage of his son to a Spanish princess, this does not explain the concurrent expansion of a wider program of the same attitude in Scotland. This movement in James’s other kingdom proclaimed his support of ceremonious Anglicanism as more than merely a show for a future princess in London. In Scotland in 1617, James had plans for improvements of the chapels at Edinburgh Castle at Holyroodhouse. They included works done in England by Nicholas Stone and the painter Matthew Goodrich done in the English style.
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with figures of saints and apostles for the royal closet. In addition, a “glorious” altar was set up
with Bibles, candles, and a new organ so that the English service could be said daily.45

As noted earlier, even though the Spanish match failed, it did produce two new chapels for
Roman Catholic worship, Somerset House and St. James, both created from 1623 to 1625. The
chapel at St. James was a double cube without transepts, and it incorporated a first floor closet or
royal pew at the west end. This chapel fit the faith of Charles, as well as that of his bride. Unlike
James’s faith, which was founded on theological underpinnings and disputation, Charles’s faith
was founded on devotions and on the proper ordering of the place of worship, along with the
ceremonialist notions found in the beauty of holiness.46 As with his father, Charles also ordered
embellishment to his chapels in Scotland. For his Scottish coronation, Charles saw to the
renovation of his Scottish chapels. This was to satisfy his own needs and to set an example for
his subjects. The coronation in 1633 took place in the Abbey at Holyroodhouse, which was
repaired, redecorated, and set like an English Church with the altar in the east end. It was set in
front of a tapestry depicting a crucifix. The Archbishop of St. Andrews presided in accordance
with the Anglican rite. To the dismay of his Scottish subjects, he left Edinburgh and moved to
Falklands, where the chapel was set up according the practice of the English Church. This move
left little doubt in the minds of his Scottish subjects about his religious preferences or which
direction he was taking his religious settlement.47

45 Simon Thurley, 241.


In the Chapel Royal, bowing to the altar was encouraged, crucifixes were set up for holy week, and altars in the east end of the chapel replaced communion tables. The king began to attend and take part in the liturgies rather than gathering at sermon time as in the Elizabethan and most of the Jacobean period. Music became prominent again in worship. As with Matthew Wren, Laud, and others, Charles saw these innovations as the re-establishment of the true Elizabethan settlement. For them, the canons of 1640 continued the preservation of rituals, which were preserved from time immemorial in the true “catholic” church and “within the Chapels Royal.” Unfortunately, the iconoclasm of the Commonwealth swept away the chance to visualize the majesty of the late Caroline royal chapels.

Some evidence does remain of this movement toward image, toward visual culture during the reign of Charles. The chapel at Peterhouse, Cambridge, was constructed between 1628 and 1632 while Matthew Wren was Master there. The “beauty of holiness” was seen here in a magnificent marble “frontispiece” for the altar. Windows were filled with painted glass and frescoes were added. Two London churches of this period stand out as examples of royal and Laudian tastes proclaimed in parish churches. St. Giles-in-the-fields (1628-31) and St. Katharine Cree in London, constructed during the same period and whose embellishment survives, were lavishly decorated (Figure 6-1). The research of John Newman and Julia Merritt demonstrated that the royal chapels were not isolated beautifications. These authors identified a shift in parish church building and beautification during this brief period.
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St. Katharine is a category by itself. Built in the brief period when Laud was bishop of London, it was a restoration and enrichment of the depredations of the Tudor Reform. Laud consecrated the church on 31 January 1631. His great enemy Prynne recorded this with derision. Like the Chapel Royal--the private chapel of a royal consort--the queen’s chapel at Somerset House was a building of enormous liturgical and architectural significance. The tastes of Henrietta Maria were expressed in her chapels. The similarities to Laudian taste and the emerging Catholic presence should not be underestimated.

Catholic chapels, such as Somerset House designed by Jones in 1632, the chapel at St. James (A-71), and an oratory at Whitehall, were splendid. We have a notion of how these chapels were fitted out in an engraving made during the restoration (A-90). These chapels were not only popular with Catholics but were frequented by high-church Anglicans. Guaranteed freedom of worship in her own chapel by treaty, Henrietta Maria set the standard for royal chapels, both architecturally and liturgically. In all these chapels, altars and rails were provided in lavish marble or gilded wood, were repainted with her arms and badges.

The Somerset chapel had transepts with radiating chapels. The first mass there was a spectacle not seen in England for nearly a century, and it was deliberately designed to impress the court. It set a standard. Charles visited these chapels more than once, which could have done nothing positive for his reputation among the “godly.” Pere Cyprian Gamache, a Capuchin monk, part of the household of the queen, described the chapel at the east end of Somerset House. He related what the worshiper experienced.

A paradise of glory, about 40 feet in height. There was a great arch, supported by two pillars, about 5-1/2 feet from the two sidewalls of the chapel. The spaces between the

pillars and the wall served for passages between the sacristy and the altar, and the choir, with the organ and other instruments, was on either side over these vacant places. The altar stood outside the arch, and there were six steps leading up to it. Behind the altar was a dove holding the Blessed Sacrament, and forming the centre of a series of separate oval frames painted with angels seated on clouds, most ingeniously contrived, with the aid of perspective hidden lights, so to deceive the eye and to produce the illusion of a considerable space occupied by a great number of figures. There were seven of these ovals—over the outer and large ones consisting of angels playing on musical instruments, the central ones of angels vested as deacons, and carrying censors, and the inner ones with child angels in various attitudes of devotion. Immediately round the dove were cherubim and seraphim in glory, surrounded by rays of light.50

François Dieussart designed this “splendor” of Baroque art for worship of the Eucharist and for amazement. Dieussart hid the “heavenly host” on “clouds” behind a curtain. When the congregation entered at the crucial moment, he drew the curtains aside. Reputedly, the queen wept with joy and Charles was so fascinated that he spent an hour and a half looking over the “mysteries” after Mass.51 It was the best of the Baroque in its clarity, its emotion, and its ability to make an impact on the viewer and engage the worshiper. Charles was indeed one of the most impressed. In the works of the 1630s, he tried to emulate this Catholic splendor. It was a splendor of order, dignity, and classical beauty.

The queen’s chapel and household were considered centers for the hope of English Catholics and fear of Puritans. The chapel was a magnet for Catholic worshippers. This scandalized some at court. Some authors suggested it also scandalized the king and Laud.

50 Joanna H. Harting, Catholic London Missions from the Reformation to the Year 1850 (London: Sands, 1903), 9.

Perhaps the enthusiasm of the Catholics did, but no evidence indicates that the decorations bothered them. There were unsuccessful attempts to curtail attendance at the queen’s chapel. However, these seem to have been halfhearted attempts considering the number of high-profile conversions to Catholicism in the queen’s circle. For many at court, it was difficult to distinguish between works for the queen, the king’s adornment of his own chapels, and Laud’s substantial resolve to re-order the parishes of England.

**Search for Order in Court Life**

At the beginning of his reign, Charles moved quickly to change the informality and disarray, which was a hallmark of the less formal court of James. Henrietta, with her formal French/Italian upbringing, was instrumental for the importation of propriety. As in France and Spain, Charles ordered stricter access in the court to his royal presence. This stricter access was something he saw at the Spanish court and at Henrietta Maria’s court in Paris. The Venetian ambassador noted that Charles “observes a rule of great decorum.” He made it clear that he was not to be “pestered.” Charles valued his privacy and barred most from some of the innermost rooms of the palace to instill decency fit for a king. Charles was trying to turn a new page at court. It was one with a new emphasis and “a tone of order, formality, and decorum.” This meant a change in the palace structure at Whitehall. Charles contemplated plans to change the
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54 Kevin Sharpe, 229.
physical environs by rebuilding the palace “along more rational, classical ordered lines.” Charles also wanted to rebuild the monarchy and state along these rational lines.

The ambassador of Venice reported in his correspondence that Charles had “drawn up rules for himself, dividing the day from his very early rising, for prayers, exercises, audiences, business, eating and sleeping.” Charles was not just a personality who tried to control himself; he wished to influence others by the example of his personal virtue. Sharpe noted that Charles tried to impose this desirable quality on others. In Charles’s most important pursuits, “We may discern that striving for, that obsession with ordering . . . was the dominant feature of Charles as man and monarch.” Though Sharpe denies Charles as an authoritarian, he admits that he was a believer in James’s “top down” vision of absolutism. Order and orders came from above, according to his father’s political thoughts. Reality was expected to conform to theory. This was also the logical continuation of James’s political thought.

“Charles sought to establish a well-regulated court as a shrine of virtue and decorum.” He tried to make the court a microcosm of what he wanted his kingdoms to be in the larger macrocosm. Charles wanted a virtuous commonwealth that was under his paternal and beneficent rule. However, not everyone was ready to make a pilgrimage to the “shrine” he was building. Charles, obsessed with a world of order, was not always cognizant of the realities on the ground. This is commendable, but it also raised some questions about his ability to live in the
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55 Kevin Sharpe, 230.
56 Kevin Sharpe, 228.
57 Kevin Sharpe, Personal Rule, 193-194.
“real” world. Sharpe reminded us that Charles “sat scrutinizing plans for a place at Whitehall
twice the size of the Escorial”\textsuperscript{59} even when he was a prisoner in his own kingdom.

**The Authority of Images**

An important illustration of Charles’s embracing art for political purpose is Gerrit van Hunthorst’s *Apollo and Diana* of 1628 (A-91). Apollo and Diana are enthroned at the top left. Apollo has the features of Charles and Diana those of Henrietta Maria. Below is Mercury, who introduces the liberal arts, led by Grammar holding a book. The two figures who introduce the arts are the Duke and Duchess of Buckingham. Logic, Rhetoric, Geometry, Astronomy, Arithmetic, and Music banish vices such as Ignorance, Envy and Lust. They flee in the lower left-hand corner before the Virtues. Charles most assuredly sought to be a grand patron of all seven arts and thought he could forge the kingdom in his cultural revolution through example and what he saw as enlightenment.

Charles’s fondness and promotion of such arts, particularly painting and masques, which increased during his personal rule, received considerable critique during the early part of his reign. William Prynne used harsh words, going so far as to include Henrietta Maria in the category of “women actors, notorious whores.”\textsuperscript{60} Authors such as Peter Lake, Steven Orgel, and Roy Strong recorded even Ben Jonson’s reservations about court entertainment as being close to “idolatry” when the focus was on the royal person.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{59} Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, 213.


\textsuperscript{61} See Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones: The Theater of the Stuart Court*, (Berkeley, 1973) vol. 2, 1-75; R. M. Smuts, 162-168; and Martin Butler, *Theater and Crisis, 1632-1642* (Cambridge, 1984), Ch. 5. All these historians agree that there was major resentment among the “godly” in the way that the masques portrayed the royalty of England as semi-divine.
Charles disregarded these critiques. Art was to extol the virtue of the prince and to show his special relationship to the divine in the natural order. Masques, then artwork seemed to James and Anne, and also Charles and Henrietta Maria a natural way to accomplish their goals. These monarchs embraced the divine right of kings; kingship was at the center of the natural order of their world. The king was a reflection of God and was the chief intermediary for the kingdom, nowhere better expressed than in the Banqueting House Cycle. It was also central to the artistic vocabulary of the earlier works of the Spanish Court, the French Court, and the Italian princely courts.

The ideal image of the prince represented him as the virtuous hero and father of his people, the image of God. This notion was “an integral feature of the Counter-Reformation and the culture of the Baroque.”62 Through analysis of the major artistic commissions of Charles, a Catholic aesthetic permeates much of these works, especially true in scale. Traditionally, English historians argued that these works were a “new kind” of Protestant art and ideology that was “innovated” by the Stuarts. However, in comparison to other contemporary works and cycles in Catholic countries, the iconography of these works can be read within the context of earlier Catholic portrayals of kingship or religion. Therefore, their Englishness or Protestant character looses some of its novelty.

An element of “ambiguity” shows through these works of art. Possibly, this ambiguity was intended to help unite those various poles found within English society. This “blurring of
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confessional lines” would make sense, as Stuarts claimed to preside over a national church which was a *via media*, both Catholic and Reformed. This “ambiguity,” if successful, would stretch across the spectrums of the Church of England and the English court to embrace perhaps even Catholics. However, the most difficult groups to “please” were the Puritans and separatist groups, who seemed unlikely to be pleased with any artistic program showing compromise with the greater European Catholic culture.

“Protestant innovation” may have been intended in these symbols. However, many of the courtiers present, who were “indoctrinated” with works of art, often perceived these as crypto-Catholic in nature. The great writer Milton was a prime example of the “intended” audience of these Baroque masterpieces of painting, architecture, and sculpture. Milton, a member of the “minor nobility,” rejected these works as anti-Christian and popery. These artistic statements had the opposite of their intended effect if they were anti-Catholic polemics in that they rallied Protestant critics to the cause of Civil War. This meant that these works either were misunderstood or that the message the monarchy was sending was rejected. In either case, Puritans used works such as the Banqueting House as evidence of the “popery” of Charles before, during, and after the English Civil War.

**Banqueting House as a Religious Monument: James, the Papacy, and Solomon**

The English kings were not the first to look back to history to biblical personages for emulation. Catholic kings and emperors had been doing this throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Charles V and his son Philip II rejuvenated the notion of the divine right of kings during this period. Many of the same heroes--already celebrated in the Catholic Middle Ages--were used to reinterpret and invent a new “Protestant history,” and they were only slightly “repackaged.” The English preferred Old Testament kings rather than Catholic heroes, such as Constantine the Great and Charlemagne, yet they used them from time to time. They also looked
back at Britain’s mythical past in the Roman period and at a genealogy that included the Trojans (just as the genealogies of the Hapsburgs some twenty-five years earlier). The pre-Reformation and Counter-Reformation Catholic rulers first used the iconography of the English monarchy. One such example was Sixtus IV. Sixtus IV, a founder or restorer of important institutions and a major patron of arts and letters, established (or re-established) the Vatican Library and new hospitals and built two of the most important churches in Rome, Santa Maria del Popolo and Santa Maria della Pace. His most important accomplishment was building his personal chapel, which would become the private chapel of the popes, the Sistine. In his building schemes, he commissioned such great artists as Antonio Del Pollaiuolo and Sandro Botticelli.

The writings of the Old Testament gave the dimensions of the temple. The chapel was shaped as a double cubed space in imitation of Solomon’s fabled building. Sixtus’s connection with a revival of learning and his building schemes naturally led to a comparison to Solomon as the great builder and reformer of the people of Israel. According to his contemporaries, this was a connection Sixtus relished and encouraged. His importance in the “resurrection” of Rome was paramount in changing it from a sleepy provincial city to the center of the Renaissance. His nephew, Pope Julius II, would be the pope to complete the decoration of the Sistine Chapel with the cycle painted by Michelangelo on the ceiling (between 1508 and 1512).

63 As noted in Chapter 2 of this study, the papacy, the kings, and the princes of Catholic Europe were far out in front of the English monarchy in the use of historical and biblical persons, places, and images. When it came to claims of emulation or connection to the most important saint/heroes of English Protestantism, King Solomon, Constantine the Great, and Saint George, England followed the continent.

The Arch of Constantine was painted in the Sistine Chapel in two of the most important scenes from the fresco cycle painted in the 1480’s fifty years before the use of similar images in England. From Henry VIII through James and Charles, temporary or permanent arches were constructed to celebrate various events in the monarchs’ lives. Botticelli used this symbol of Constantine in *The Punishment of Korah* and in the background of Perugino’s *Christ Giving the Keys to St. Peter*. This triumphal arch alludes to the (fictitious) imperial grant of temporal power by Constantine to the Western church through the auspices of the papacy. Nevertheless, it also celebrates the importance of the first Christian emperor.

Sixtus IV illustrated through this remembrance the position of the papacy as a successor of the Old Testament, New Testament, and Roman Empire. His assertion through building and art was a restating of the view that the pope was the true and legitimate successor to sacred history. Evoking the Temple of Solomon in the dimensions of the Sistine and the good government of Constantine helped to illustrate the pope’s claim over both church and state.

Other popes continued to make this comparison. This association with Solomon and the papacy would reach its peak during the reign of Pope Urban VIII. Urban, as with many of his predecessors, relished the notion that the pope was the true successor of princely virtue. After all, the papacy continued to call itself the “Prince of the Apostles.” From early medieval times popes emulated, some more successfully than others, the notion that they were Solomonic rulers and advocates of learning and reform. It was no accident that Gianlorenzo Bernini created several monuments with Solomonic themes during Urban’s papacy. These were constructed throughout the last years of James I, and during and beyond the reign of Charles I.

Urban VIII in many ways completed the “circle” begun by Sixtus IV in the claim to papal pre-eminence and the establishment of papal supremacy in Italy. Urban was the last pope to
extend the papal territory and the last to build on such a grand scale. Urban’s long pontificate from August 1623 through July 1644 was marked with spectacular artwork. As the patron of architects and sculptors, the likes of Bernini and Borromini, and painters such as Claude Lorrain, Rubens, and Nicholas Poussin, he shaped his image. These artists aggrandized the papacy in general but specifically Urban VIII. His pontificate, which covered twenty-one years of the Thirty Years’ War, was eventful in that he cared at times more for the enhancement of his family and his personal control of central Italy than about the restoration of Catholicism in northern Europe. But he did try through back channels to warm up relations with England.

Like his contemporary English, French and Spanish monarchs (and the English Parliament), his self-interest often trumped wider political and spiritual efforts. Urban fought fellow Catholics just as the English fought fellow Protestants when it suited political needs. Like James and Charles, Urban worked more for an adjustment of the balance of parties that would best favor his own strength and independence. Also like James and Charles, Urban clearly missed excellent opportunities for reconciliation both in the Catholic Church and in the realm of politics. Because of Urban’s cynicism, the papacy was left out of the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648.

Like Charles, it was to be in art that he had a lasting contribution to western culture. He commissioned many theological/political works for St. Peter’s. The interior was largely finished under Urban. The most important work was the high altar area where Bernini built the magnificent Catholic statement about faith and politics in the baldacchino over the grave of St. Peter (Figure 6-2). The majority of the themes found in this work derived from the legacy of Constantine and Solomon, but particularly from the Solomonic Temple.
A major monument had been over the grave of Peter. In the original fourth century church built by Constantine, “Both tomb and altar were enshrined in a ciborium of Solomonic columns, so-called because of their legendary importation by the emperor”\textsuperscript{65} from the ruins of the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem. According to tradition, these columns adorned the Holy of Holies, or Tabernacle of the Most High. \textsuperscript{66} Authentic or not, Solomonic columns have been connected with Christ’s Passion and the Eucharist since their use during the Constantinian period.

In order to achieve an aesthetic desirable for the project emphasizing the connection between the papacy and legitimate religion of the past, Bernini imitated the Solomonic columns and greatly magnified them in size. The dark bronze medium highlighted with gilt provides a contrast of bright colors in contrast to the cool whites of the marble walls. Bernini used the original columns to embellish works framing the holiest relics in the Vatican collection, such as the \textit{Relief of the Holy Lance} (Figure 6-3). Bernini’s work also made further connections to the mission and role of the papacy as successor to the Old Testament, Christ, and the history of Christian antiquity.

Work began in the summer of 1624, several years before the commission of the Banqueting House paintings by Rubens. News of this work spread throughout Europe because of the scale and the scope of what was intended. The Holy Year of 1625 also helped to spread the importance and “rumors” of this commission from Urban. The ambitious plans for the main decoration of the Basilica enhanced Bernini’s reputation, making him a much sought-after superstar. The plans were too momentous to complete. Originally, the top was to be crowned


\textsuperscript{66} Charles Scribner III, 70.
with a huge bronze *Christ Risen in Majesty*. But the large figure could not be put into place, as the delicate construction could not hold the enormous weight of such a bronze figure.

Bernini’s program was a symbolic concetto, which would be a tripartite drama for the crossing of Saint Peter’s. He would tell the story of the triumph of Christ and emphasize the true religion preserved in Catholic Rome in the high altar of the popes. This drama consisted of the “sacrifice on the altar (crucifix), through his resurrection (statue), and culminating in his heavenly enthronement as Judge (dome mosaic).”67 As the weight of the statute was unsupportable, a globe surmounted by a Latin cross symbolizing Christ’s ultimate and universal victory substituted as the crowning feature on the baldacchino. “Through the power of his symbolic architecture Bernini transferred Jerusalem—the site of both the Jewish Temple and Christian salvation—to Rome.”68 It appears that Rubens had this same notion a few years later in his design for the Banqueting House. In the ceiling of the Banqueting House was a “transfer” of legitimacy in Peter Paul Rubens’s allegory of James I as Solomon and as a New Constantine, a spiritual and temporal ruler of a renewed British Empire. Like Urban and Bernini before him, Charles and Rubens made a singular dynastic statement about the divine nature of Stuart kingship through the expressions of Rubens’s canvasses.

Charles and Urban used these same symbols of virtuous and divinely installed rulership for the same reasons: legitimacy, virtue, and true religion. However, it is clear that Latin Catholicism used Constantine and Solomon extensively in the past and continuously throughout the Renaissance and Baroque. Rubens also used the vocabulary of Baroque Catholic art in the Banqueting House cycle as the “language” of religion, virtue, and politics. Though the works

67 Charles Scribner III, 70.

68 Charles Scribner III, 70.
completed for Charles I in the 1620s and 1630s were done for a “Protestant” monarch, these works are best understood within the context of a Counter-Reformation tradition. This is especially true that James and Charles also made claims to their own “catholic” status.

Bernini had the enhancement of his master in mind. Bernini’s genius and inspired solution to the problem of architecture, sculpture, mosaic, and painting in the baldacchino schema was to “create a hybrid out of a traditional (permanent) columned ciborium and a festive (ephemeral) baldachin of gold cloth.” The fusion of sculptural architecture was a triumph of necessary illusion, as this work rises to a height of a modern eight-story building. The cost of the work was enormous. The vast sums for beeswax needed for the casting were twice the expense of the gold for the gilding. The pope, as Solomon’s successor at St. Peter’s, was celebrated by the proclamation of the glory of this baldacchino. Of “all Urban’s commissions none so epitomized the aspirations of his reign as this dynamically soaring tower of energy, a bronze emblem of papal power that seemingly triumphs over the laws of nature and suspends gravity.”

The baldacchino, and in particular the Solomonic columns, were full of Christian imagery as well as Antique Roman and Old Testament iconography. In particular, “the ancient Solomonic design had become, over the Christian centuries, associated with the Eucharist.” Images of cherubs and animals playing throughout the vegetation enhanced the vine-and-branches imagery found on the original columns. This is also part of the peripheral design of the Banqueting House ceiling as angels, putti, and cherubs lead animals through vegetation on large bands at the outside.

69 Charles Scribner III, 70.

70 Charles Scribner III, 70.

71 W. Chandler Kirwin, *Powers Matchless: The Pontificate of Urban VIII, the Baldachin, and Gian Lorenzo Bernini* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 120.
of the design of Rubens’s *Apotheosis of James I Flanked by Two Panels of Precessions of Putti Caring Garlands, Torches, and Cornucopias* (A-10). Eucharistic imagery was emphasized by the reuse of the original Solomonic columns. These were used in the niches at the corners of the crossing in proximity to the most sacred relics stored at the Vatican and connected to the Passion of Christ.\(^72\) The only major change in design for the columns created by Bernini for the baldacchino was to incorporate laurel branches instead of the grape tendrils as on the originals. This substitution did not change the essential iconography. The angels on top of the baldacchino hold laurel crowns triumphantly for “the assembly of martyrs below [the floor of Saint Peters]: an ever-present symbol of their ultimate triumph and victory.”\(^73\)

The change of the laurel for the grapevine and bees for other animals playing in the vegetation, as in the original columns, was for the enjoyment of Urban, as both of these symbols appear in his coat of arms.

To be sure, the laurel is a Barberini device, but the incorporation of the laurel on the columns were directly dictated by the significance of the site as a martyrium…The sacramental reference is continued in the selection of the tripartite shaft for the Baldachin. The decision to reposition eight of the original ten marble Solomonic columns with their quadripartite shafts form the apsidal screen to the upper reliquary niches precipitated the plan to decorate the Baldachin’s columns with Laurel boughs. Nothing was lost; rather a richer and more resonant series of association was thereby established and the primacy of the entire crossing as a house and crown of martyrs was brilliantly affected.\(^74\)

“The putto holding a laurel crown was a major leitmotif not only of the shafts’ decoration but also of the other places, binding together the most sacred locations in the basilica with the

\(^{72}\) W. Chandler Kirwin, 120.

\(^{73}\) W. Chandler Kirwin, 120.

\(^{74}\) W. Chandler Kirwin, 313.
symbol of martyrdom.”⁷⁵ All this decoration was perfectly symbolic of Christ’s martyrdom for “the good of the many,” and the overall stress on Eucharist symbolism is undoubted. This was a statement of Catholic supremacy both politically, with the inclusion of Constantine’s legacy and the good government of Solomon. The crossing decorations at St. Peters emphasized the legitimate and true faith as seen by the Catholic world through the synthesis of Eucharistic symbolism and princely power.

Themes of Iconography in the Banqueting House

We now focus specifically on the subject of the Banqueting House cycle. This work was important for the Stuart monarchy as a center for what was to be their political authority and their religious authority. Peter Paul Rubens, who was in Rome often in the early part of the 1600s, was extremely familiar with the work of Bernini, Paulo Veronese, and Raphael, who all used throughout their commissions the iconography of Solomonic columns kept at St. Peter’s. These columns were inspirations and religious symbols of the Eucharist, martyrdom, right authority, and wisdom. Rubens had copies of Veronese’s works using the columns, as well as a copy of Raphael’s tapestry cartoon for The Healing of the Lame Man, which Rubens copied with extreme care when he was in Genoa.⁷⁶

Rubens repeatedly used the storied columns in works. His treatment usually emphasized their power to evoke true religion, the power of kings, or the importance of the subject matter. He often used the motif of Solomonic columns with works that had a Eucharistic theme. In any of the works Rubens designed, incorporated Solomonic columns, the columns never carry
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⁷⁵ W. Chandler Kirwin, 135.

⁷⁶ John Shearman, Raphael’s Cartoons in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen and the Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel (London: Phaidon, 1972), 147.
weight, which is inconsistent with for purpose of a column. Consequently, they are monuments themselves rather than elements of architecture. In Rubens’s own designs for the *Triumph of the Eucharist over Pagan Sacrifice* (A-92), he used these columns for such a purpose. Completed a decade before the design and implementation of the Banqueting House ceiling, Rubens’s Solomonic columns frame both sides of this design. In these tapestries, he used the Solomonic columns as perfect devices to frame theological statements about the Eucharist due to traditional use of the columns and their association with true religion. Rubens engaged this iconography just as Bernini would a few years later in the baldacchino at St. Peters.

Rubens made the columns of Solomon central in his statement about James I in one of the panels in the Banqueting House. Here Rubens apotheosized Charles’s father in what is not only a statement about good government, but also a statement about the head of the English Church. It is important to note the changing emphasis on the Eucharist in England during this period. The Banqueting House cycle was created precisely at the time English Counter-Reformation movement gained control. They offered a complicated and beautiful worship, and one that included the Eucharist at its center, rather than preaching.

English historians such as Roy Strong emphasized the importance of Inigo Jones in the design of the Banqueting House ceiling, but recent research points to collaboration between Rubens and Charles as the most likely scenario for the iconography of the design. Eucharistic
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77 Roy Strong argued that Inigo Jones primarily did the design of the Banqueting House ceiling in his work *BritanniaTriumphans: Inigo Jones, Rubens, and Whitehall Palace*, published in 1980.

78 Mark Morford in his *Stoics and Neostoics: Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991) argued that Rubens primarily designed the Banqueting House ceiling (A-9) and that these works were essentially influenced by neo-stoicism and Rubens’s strong Catholic faith.
themes would have been most acceptable to Charles, and he would have understood the use of Solomon’s columns by his chosen artist in this manner. Many others had used these columns in the same way in the past, including Raphael in his famous work, which was part of Charles’s vast collection of Catholic religious art.

The Prince-Hero: Peter Paul Rubens and Justus Lipsius, Bernini and Charles I

One of the most important connections to the British court and Catholic thought about art was Justus Lipsius, through his close association with the Rubens brothers. The choice of Peter Paul Rubens, as decorator for the ceiling of the Banqueting House, was important for the demonstration of the legacy of James I as “The New Solomon” and the founder of a dynasty that had “re-created” a “Great Britain” again. It was indeed a grand coup for Charles to engage Rubens, one of the most important painters, diplomats, and intellectually qualified individuals, for this work. To have the most important actively-working painter take on this commission was to show the rest of Europe that England had arrived. Charles tried to lure Rubens into being his court painter. For Rubens, this would have been a “downgrade” from the Spanish courts and French courts, which steadily employed him.

As a diplomat, he learned to appreciate his opponents and often became friends with them, as he had with Charles. He seems to have had a dexterity learned from his association with Lipsius. Lipsius, as with most other anti-Machiavellians, was a theologian who skirted both the Catholic and the Protestant world. He is a prime example of the fluidity of thought that flowed between the poles of extreme Catholicism and extreme Protestantism and that desperately searched for a middle way, as did the Stuarts.

Lipsius was one of the best-known scholars at the turn of the seventeenth century. Born in Overyssche, a village near Brussels and Louvain, he studied first with Jesuits in Cologne and then at the Catholic University of Louvain. He also visited Rome where he stayed for two years
to study the ancient monuments and to explore the libraries of classical literature at the Vatican. Lipsius left during the Civil War in the Low Countries and applied for a position at the Lutheran University of Jena. This was the first of a number of moves that required Lipsius to change his publicly professed faith. The colleagues at Jena always remained skeptical of his “radical transformation,” and he left Jena after two years to return to Cologne.

In 1576, Lipsius returned to Catholic Louvain only to leave after Spanish troops looted his property in the Netherlands a second time during the Civil War. He then went to the Calvinist University of Leiden. He was in Leiden for thirteen years where he wrote two of his most famous books, De Constantia Libri Duo in 1584 and Politicorum, siue Ciulis doctrinae in 1589. These works were important in that they discussed the importance of the prince as an absolute monarch and were extremely important as sources for the idea of a “virtuous prince-hero.” However, Lipsius eventually returned home and sought reconciliation with his Catholic roots, disappointed with Calvinism.

One thing is certain, Lipsius was no iconoclast. It is likely that both of his conversions to Protestantism, one Lutheran and the other Calvinist, may have had more to do with obtaining important teaching positions in relatively peaceful locations. This shift in religious affiliation was made possible because of his moderate “proto-ecumenical” outlook. His conversions were always considered suspect by his Protestant co-religionists, but his genius and skill as a scholar made up for his lack of Protestant zeal.

Lipsius returned to Louvain and accepted the Chair of Latin History and Literature. His return to Catholicism enhanced his reputation in the Roman religion as one of the great humanist
philosophers of his time. Lipsius is once again an important example of how fluid religious connections were in the Early Modern Period. He is a prime example of someone who had a successful career in all three denominations. But most scholars would argue that stoicism and his Catholic roots were the most important influences in his writings.

Among Lipsius’s friends and close associates were the famous printer Christopher Plantin and Philip Rubens, Lipsius’s favorite student and brother of Peter Paul Rubens. Rubens portrayed Lipsius, after his death, along with Philip and himself in The Four Philosophers (A-93). This connection was especially influential in the intellectual development of Peter Paul Rubens. In many ways, Rubens who put the vision of the prince-hero sketched out in Lipsius’s writings into paint.

In Politicorum, sive Civilis doctrinae Lipsius drew on a wide range of classical works with emphasis upon Tacitus. The treatise was concerned with the creation of a civil life in which everyone should profit with mutual benefit. This work divides into six books: Book 1 is an analysis of the conditions of virtue and prudence. Here he argued that virtue requires piety and goodness and that prudence is dependent upon use and memory. Book Two stated that government is necessary for any civil life and the best form of government is a principality. Here civil concord requires all to submit to the will of only one principality. This is for the good of all. The rest of Book 2 deals with the themes of justice and clemency as private princely virtues. Book 3 focused upon princely prudence, the major theme for the rest of his work. Two types of
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79 Mark Morford, xxi-xv. The life and works of Lipsius are well known, as is his return to Catholicism.
prudence are emphasized—the innate, God-given prudence of the prince, and the advice of the councilors.80

Lipsius clearly pre-empted Hobbes in saying that order and peace far outweigh civil liberties and personal freedom. Order and peace became major themes in Basilikon Doron and were consistent themes in the masques done for the Stuarts. These themes are emphasized in the paintings done for the Banqueting House. Lipsius lived in and out of civil war for almost twenty years. For him, political rights were of little consolation when surrounded by violence and anarchy. Therefore, the first priority in politics was to secure peace and establish a safe environment for commerce and prosperity. Lipsius believed that to achieve this security in statecraft, it was best for power to be concentrated in one individual, the absolute monarch.

Lipsius’s influence is found in the works of Peter Paul Rubens and his brother’s writings. Rubens gives a divine quality to the royals he paints. Interestingly, James I also read Lipsius. In Basilikon Doron, James argued that one should not put too much emphasis on a revived stoicism.81 However, much of the thought of Basilikon Doron was not opposed to the general shared outcomes of a revived Christianized stoicism, as envisioned by Lipsius. Christian stoicism was the life of balance often portrayed in Rubens’s religious works.

The Four Philosophers (A-93) is an excellent example. It is a celebration of the life of Lipsius and his most important disciples. Here the great scholar is portrayed in an academic robe with fur trim. It was bequeathed because of its great value to the church of Notre Dame at Halle

80 Justus Lipsius, Politicorum, siue, Ciuilis doctrinae libri sex, qui ad principatum maximè spectant (Londini: Typis Georgii Bishop, 1590). More than 30 translations of the works of Lipsius were printed in London before 1630. Lipsius would have been an important link between Catholic and Protestant thought in that he was associated with Lutheran, Calvinist, and Catholic scholarship throughout most of his life.

81 See Chapter 3 of this study and its discussion of Basilikon Doron.
(a bequest that was criticized with sarcasm by Protestants so much that Woverius published a pamphlet that defended the sincerity of the donation by Lipsius in Woverius’s *Lipsiani Donari Assertio*).\(^{82}\) Lipsius and his students, Philip Rubens and Woverius, are the focus of this painting, but three other figures are shown in this work: Peter Paul Rubens, Seneca, and Lipsius’s dog Mopsus. Mopsus was the scholar’s favorite dog, and was included to show the virtues of vigilance, loyalty, and intelligence associated with dogs in Renaissance paintings. Philip Rubens on the right holds a pen as if to take down the words of his master, and Woverius on the left holds an open book. Peter Paul Rubens on the far right looks directly at the viewer of the painting, inviting one to be part of the conversation. Seneca is placed in a classical niche with a vase of tulips. Two tulips are open, symbolizing the completed lives of Lipsius and Philip, who both had recently died, and two tulips are still closed, symbolizing the continuing lives of Peter Paul and Woverius. Lipsius points to what is most likely his translation of Seneca, therefore continuing to play the role of the teacher. Peter Paul Rubens owned the bust of Seneca, and it appeared in several of his drawings, engravings, and other works.\(^{83}\)

An illustration of the importance of his brother and of Lipsius in Rubens’s life is that he did another version of the *Four Philosophers* called *Portrait with Friends* (A-94). In this work, the Catholic roots of both Rubens brothers and of Lipsius and Woverius are emphasized. It too commemorates the death of Lipsius in 1605. The three living friends, Woverius and the two brothers (Phillip was still alive at this time), occupy the center, and Lipsius is seen in profile on
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\(^{83}\) Mark Morford, 5.
the right.84 One sees at the left two other unidentified colleagues. In the background at the center of the painting, is a scene of the *Burial of the Virgin* (a magnifying glass would be useful to see this clearly) and a boat crossing the water toward the religious scene.85 The theme shows that even in death Lipsius continues to influence their lives. The inclusion of the *Burial of the Virgin* is an emphasis on eternity and resurrection. Mary, through her assumption into heaven, is the first born of the dead after Christ (in Catholic and Orthodox theology), a notion established as early as the sixth century. She was included as a hopeful sign to all the friends for eternal life and redemption.

According to Mark Morford, this is also a sign that the love of friends—*amor post mortem durans*—conquers death. Therefore, the living continue their lives influenced by their rich associations with the dearly departed.86 This notion of *amor post mortem durans* should also be included in a reappraisal of the Banqueting House Ceiling. For Charles, the departed James certainly would belong to the category of the “beloved dead” who are to be remembered, honored, emulated, and communed with. Thus, the ceiling at Whitehall is also a cenotaph.

The influence of Lipsius on Rubens was felt in many of Rubens’s religious works or works about virtue. Lipsius’s philosophical presence is found in the Banqueting House Ceiling. This coincides with the aesthetic of Charles I, whose interest in the visual arts not only skirted the aesthetic boundaries of English Protestantism, but also clearly crossed the line of the Calvinist religious divide. Commissions such as the Banqueting House Ceiling and other

84 Mark Morford, 13.
85 Mark Morford, 13.
86 Mark Morford, 13.
paintings produced by Rubens, Van Dyck, and other noted artists clearly emulate a Catholic spirituality rather than Calvinist.

Rubens first expressed interest in the ceiling for the Banqueting House in 1621, when he was working on the Medici Cycle and while the building was under construction by Inigo Jones. However, it was not until Rubens was in England from June 1629 until March 1630, acting as a diplomat, that real action took place for his employment on the massive project. Rubens had an audience with Charles at the queen’s residence at Greenwich. This was an astute setting for a diplomatic mission to help negotiate a peace between the Netherlands, Spain, and England. The queen’s palace, surrounded with Henrietta Maria’s court and Catholic co-religionists, was proof that Charles showed “moderation” toward the Catholic faith. This tolerance of Rubens’s faith was something he testified to in his letters back to his Catholic masters.

Rubens and Charles I had an extremely close relationship. Both genuinely seemed to like each other. Their love of art was at the center of this mutual admiration. Charles invited him to stay in England as court painter, and knighted Rubens for his helpfulness in bringing peace between England and Spain. However, Rubens left England and finished the paintings in Antwerp by August 1634, but they were not sent to England until the following year in December 1635.

87 Mark Morford, 204.
89 Mark Morford, 204.
The significance of the Whitehall paintings (A-9, A-10) can hardly be overestimated. These works are the “crowning glory” of the “faire” Palladian building in which Jones displayed the architectural ideals, which revolutionized the development of English architecture. “It is a paradox that the great(est) painter of the Counter-Reformation should have produced for a heretic sovereign the only one of these decorative schemes which survives in its original setting.”\(^{90}\) These paintings glorify the reign of James and therefore indirectly glorify his successor Charles as one who continues James’s good rule. Ironically, as well, they emphasize the “works” of a sovereign. This emphasis on work is a theme that seems to fit a more “traditional” if not Catholic theological outlook rather than the predominant Calvinist theology of justification or election by faith alone.

Depicted in the central panel is the concept of James’s reward “for a job well done.” Here James, taken up to heaven, receives his just judgment for good kingship (figure 5-5). Justice carrying the scales was a frequently used iconography about God’s judgment in Catholicism. This highlights a notion of good judgment for works as well as faith, a Catholic notion adopted by the Arminians. The artist provided the viewer with the outcome of James’s kingly works, redemption. Through the allegories of James’s reign of peace over war, plenty over poverty, and other ancillary works, which surround the three main canvasses devoted to James, Rubens also made a theological statement. As with Solomon, and indeed like Christ, James’s reign was that of a “prince of peace.”

This work evolved through a series of preliminary drawings by Rubens at the height of his powers, displaying the virtue of the early Stuarts as he had previously done for the Bourbons, Medici, Hapsburgs, and Gonzagas. His knowledge of classical allegory and his ability to design
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^{90} Oliver Millar, 37.
on a huge and magnificent scale were steeped in the traditions of Titian, Veronese, and Tintoretto. The works particularly delighted King Charles. Here Charles’s lavish taste, meant to proclaim his own chivalric virtue and manliness before an admiring audience of courtiers, was proclaimed. These ideas were essential to the court culture of the Caroline and Jacobean courts. Reflected in contemporary writing and also in the masques, this notion was never better displayed than on the ceiling.

As with the intellectual underpinnings of the court masques, the Whitehall paintings were consistent with Catholic, Arminian, and anti-Calvinist thought rather than with Presbyterianism, Calvinism, or Puritanism. The high drama of the ceiling reflected the masques brought to life by Jones’s works on stages. The intellect behind the masques signified a return to the grand theater of the Latin mass, which was lost in the simplified liturgy prominent at the turn of the seventeenth century. Indeed, Jones’s stages often resembled altars, which were fenced off from the “congregation” at the masques, like communion rails. A complicated “play” is also proclaimed in the ceiling panels. As religious historians point out, the anti-Calvinists and Arminians were trying to put more “theater” in the celebrations of the English Church. As decorated by Rubens, this room looked more like a Counter-Reformation church interior celebrating the life of a saint, as much as the life of a king. The ceiling panels emphasized the supremacy of the king, his support of religion, his connection with an idyllic past, and the promise of good rule for those who keep to the charted plans of the dynasty. These decorations
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are also a gauntlet, a challenge thrown down to the loyal subject by the king to support good
government by support of the monarchy.

The imagery of good government illustrated in this work included the English Church as a
wing of this government. Solomonic columns inferred this political/religious connection. For
Rubens, they were intertwined with religion and the Eucharist throughout Christian history. Until
this study, historians have not noticed this alternative interpretation of this iconography for the
Solomonic columns used at Whitehall in the Banqueting House. This is surprising in that the
official church policy at the end of James’s rule and for the entire rule of Charles before the
outbreak of Civil War emphasized the sacramental nature of Holy Communion and a return to
the use of altars rather than wood tables. Eucharistic theater once again triumphed over stark
word services.

Rubens’s repeated use of Solomonic columns in works, which celebrated the “queen of
the sacraments,” is undisputed. He used them earlier in the statements of religious and political
authority. At the same time, Bernini used them in a supreme statement about Urban VIII in
Rome with the planning and construction of the baldacchino, which enshrined the altar at St.
Peters for the Eucharist. The Arminians were attempting to move the English Church in the same
direction from the middle of James’s reign toward a sacramental piety rather than a preaching
one. Clearly, renewed sacramentalism in English piety must be taken into account when looking
at the prominence of the Solomonic connection in this cycle.

Other similarities to works done for Catholic monarchs are noticeable. The scenes in the
Banqueting House are related thematically to the Medici cycle. The first important panel of
comparison is *The Apotheosis of Henry IV and the Proclamation of the Regency of Marie de
Medici on May 14, 1610* (A-95), painted and installed between 1623 and 1625. This dates ten
years earlier than the work Rubens did for the Stuarts. It is interesting to note that Charles was in Paris for part of this time. Knowing the prince’s propensity for art, he would have examined the progress of the installation.

There are slight differences between the Stuart and Medici cycles. In the Medici cycle, the life and martyrdom of Henry IV dominate the canvas. Christ, not angels, brings Henry to heaven because of his martyrdom. However, even with this difference, these paintings have much in common. This French cycle was about the ideal Renaissance prince formed by the theological underpinning of Rubens and his associates along with Marie de’ Medici. Both works need to be seen as a whole rather than in parts. “The whole is greater than the part. Thus the glory of the individual prince, James, is subordinate to the general idea of the benefits of good government, and the program is consistent with the universal doctrines of Lipsius’s *Politica*.”

The notion of the good ruler is universally present in the work at the Banqueting House: *Sapientia* and *prudentia* are apparent everywhere in this painting cycle. Rubens shows Protestant James is as much the ideal prince as Catholic Henry, perhaps more so.

One of the figures executed in the Banqueting House was the seven-headed hydra, representing, according to Roy Strong, the triumph of Protestantism over the papacy. However, this seems unlikely. Rubens came to England as part of an attempt to diffuse religious war and to testify to Stuart tolerance. No Catholic was executed after 1619 for breaking England’s religious laws. From the early 1620s, James’s direct orders to preachers made it clear

---

93 Mark Morford, 205.

94 Mark Morford, 205.

that priests should not preach against Puritans or Catholics in any way that would cause further rancor about religion. Charles had the same general attitude. James also ceased calling the pope the “anti-Christ” during this period, and courted a cordial relationship with Vatican officials through English Catholic priests in Rome. In addition, the notion that Rubens would have been “ignorant” of what he was doing in representing the hydra as the papal anti-Christ (according to Strong) seems implausible. It appears more realistic to see the hydra along with other dragons, as representative of darkness and evil, and a more general interpretation of this figure standing for evil reviled in the Book of Revelations. A previous example appears in one of Rubens’s works for Charles, where a virtuous king/knight conquers evil. This would make James another George, the Leader of the Knights of the Garter. Evidence for this interpretation is in Rubens’s earlier work, Landscape with St. George and the Dragon (A-96). In this painting, Rubens depicts Charles precisely this way, as a destroyer of dragons (darkness and evil) alongside his Catholic queen in an idyllic landscape of peace.

The overall themes in the Banqueting House Ceiling were virtue over chaos, peace over war, temperance over intemperance. Making such a provocative statement about Catholicism when the Queen was Catholic also seems unlikely. The Banqueting House Ceiling placed an emphasis on the supremacy of wisdom, the union of the crowns of Great Britain, the king as a source of justice and the supporter of religion, and the divine authority of the king. These are personifications of ideals sketched out in Basilikon Doron and are in the speculum principis tradition. As noted in Chapter 4, which dealt with the influence of Basilikon Doron on Charles, James spent much time describing the task of the prince, whose responsibility is to govern and encourage the church. Therefore, religion, too, is an important theme of Stuart kingship.
The Banqueting House ceiling emphasized the horrors of discord and war while emphasizing the blessings of concord and peace established by the Stuarts. Rubens was especially interested in these themes because he genuinely admired the Stuarts. He admired what they accomplished, a peaceful and prosperous state. He wrote to ambassador Dupuy in August of 1629,

> This island, for example seems to me to be a spectacle worthy of interest of every gentleman, not only for the beauty of the countryside and the charm of the nation; not only for the splendor of the outward culture, which seems to be extreme, as of a people rich and happy in the lap of peace, but also for the incredible quantity of excellent pictures, statues and ancient inscriptions which are to be found in this Court.96

As a diplomat, he noted what seemed to be a stable country with a steady religious settlement that was thriving during while he was there, Charles’s Personal Rule.

Another reason to doubt Strong’s interpretation was that Charles often flirted with the papacy through diplomatic channels, especially through his wife, as noted in Chapter 5. Such a “depiction” of Catholicism and the papacy seems unlikely during the 1630s, even though it would have pleased radical Protestants at the time. Charles obviously reckoned that these radical Protestants were the genuine threat to his rule after parliamentary setbacks in the late 1620s. Catholicism was a secondary problem, and evidence shows that he tried to encourage a relationship with the papacy rather than inflame it.

The Banqueting House Ceiling is a work about balance and harmony, not conflict. Figures chosen by Rubens in the Apotheosis are particularly important to understanding the iconography of this work. Justice holds a flaming sword on scales and holds up James’s left arm. To his right, the figure of Religion holds a patera (the paten, also used for the holding the bread at Mass) in
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her right hand, a broad, shallow dish used in a ritual context to show James’s piety. In her left hand, Religion embraces an altar with a flame. Rubens explained these images in a design for the title page to Jakob Bidermann’s *Heroum Epistolae*. “The altar, the libation dish, and the jug symbolize religion and sacred ritual; the lyre and the ivy wreath[,] poetry. Thus James in the *Apotheosis* is flanked by Justice and Piety.”97 Sacred ritual therefore should be read as the sacraments of the church. This interpretation adds context to the central panel in relation to the Solomonic columns in the *Peaceful Reign of King James*, which was displayed next to the apse where the king sat.

Other parallels can be found with the ancient theme of the Solomonic columns, sacred ritual, and Eucharist in the Banqueting House works of art. Flanked by processions of putti, who carry garlands, cornucopias, and torches, there are chariots drawn by various animals.98 These themes represent, in the view of the dynasty, the near perfect ideal times of happiness, bounty, and good peace brought on by the reign of the Stuarts.99 These panels also portray the fruits of the Redemption in the theme of children/putti “playing” with wild beasts. These figures would be reminiscent one of the scripture verse about the return to the Garden of Eden spelled out in the Book of Isaiah. Note that a king ushers in this biblical paradise. Isaiah, Chapter 11, speaks about the King Immanuel where “the wolf shall be a guest of the lamb, and the leopard shall lie
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97 Mark Morford, 205. Morford rightly identified this as an altar. Such scholars as Held and Strong have previously understood it as an urn. However, Held and Strong must not have been aware of Rubens’s own description in Jakob Bidermann’s *Heroum Epistolae, Epigrammate & Herodial* (Antwerp: Mortus, 1633).

98 Mark Morford, 204.

down with the kid; the calf and the young lion shall browse together with a little child to guide them.”100

A further connection with children/putti is also noteworthy. One of the features of the legendary Solomonic columns at St. Peter’s Basilica was their original iconography. Two of the columns believed to be from Solomon’s Temple featured garlands of grapevines with putti and various animals frolicking in an apocalyptic vision of peace and plenty. Rubens was familiar with these columns and understood their iconographic significance. The two outer panels that surround the *Apotheosis of James* (A-50) form this same type of a garland motif. However, rather than encircling the paintings these paintings act as frames. In these outer rectangular panels, putti dance through the procession of idyllic vegetation. One side is drawn toward the throne; the other goes in the opposite direction. One panel depicts a triumphal chariot laden with corn drawn by a ram and wolf harnessed together. The second panel depicts a chariot in which a cornucopia is emptied and drawn by a lion and a bear. A putto tames a tiger, another tickles the ear of the tiger. These putti celebrate plenty and peace throughout the work, and can be read as God providing “daily bread” for the just man and a promise of eternal peace for the redeemed, as in the original Solomonic columns at St. Peters.

Returning to the central panel, James is taken into heaven like a Counter-Reformation saint. Justice, holding scales, concludes that James is just. He therefore ascends to heaven, judged worthy by his works as king.101 Strong is representative of a group of historians and art historians who argued that the panels were a thoroughly “Protestant” depiction of religion.102 He
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100 *The New American Bible* (Cleveland, Ohio: Collins World, 1970), 806.

101 See Chapter 4 and the analysis of James’s *Basilikon Doron*.

102 Roy Strong, 149-50.
cited Ripa as the originator of this iconography and Per Palme as the originator of this interpretation. However, they do not have answers for the most provocative and Counter-Reformation features of this central panel: Religion holds an altar, not a Bible.

The altar was now being emphasized in the Church of England. Laud’s teaching echoed Andrewes and other anti-Calvinists. Their maxim of “Christ found most present on the altar” was very much within the pre-Reformation and Counter-Reformation Catholic tradition. This was not the sermon-based piety of Protestantism. If this was not veiled Roman Catholicism, it clearly signaled a birth of an English Catholicism and a Counter-Reformation proclamation of faith rather than further movement toward biblically-based Protestantism. It seems almost “heretical” from a Calvinistic/Protestant viewpoint for Religion to hold an Altar rather than the Bible, especially if the intention was to proclaim a particularly “Protestant” iconography. This is especially true as one of James’s greatest accomplishments was the translation and publishing of a New English Bible, the version authorized by King James.

One of the most important minds in the Anglican Church, who informed the Laudians and who emphasized the importance of the altar and the sacrament of the altar, was Lancelot Andrewes. His influence is seen in Charles’s acceptance of the iconographical use of an altar in this cycle. Andrewes’s *Devotions*, one of the most popular books of the 1620s and 1630s, was full of Eucharistic devotion and was one of Charles’s favorite books. Andrewes writes:

Now “the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body, of the flesh, of Jesus Christ?” [1 Corinthians 10: 16] It is surely, and by it and by nothing more are we made partakers of this most blessed union. A little before he said, “Because the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He also would take part with them’ [Hebrews 2: 14]—may not we say the same? Because he hath so done, taken ours of us, we also ensuing His steps will participate with Him and with His flesh which He hath taken of us. It is most kindly to take part with Him in that which He took part in with us, and that to no other end but that He might make the receiving of it by us a means whereby He might ‘dwell in us, and we in Him;’ He taking our flesh, and we receiving His Spirit; by His flesh which He took of us receiving His Spirit which he imparteth to us; that, as He by ours became consors humanae
With this kind of rhetoric being preached and written on a regular basis in the late Jacobean and Caroline courts, it is no wonder that an altar was used to symbolize true religion. This truly was not far from popery.

The importance of the altar in Religion’s hand is also emphasized in the Medici cycle. Rubens showed the transfer of power from mother to son in the allegorical scene *Louis XIII Comes of Age* (A-87). Marie hands the reins of government to her son and ends her regency. The ship represents the state, now operated by Louis as he steers the vessel. Emblematic shields on the outside of the ship identify each of the rowers as virtues. The second rower’s shield depicts a flaming altar with four sphinxes, a coiling serpent and an open eye that looks downward. The second rower is Religion. Religion, along with the other virtues, empowered the state, and Marie wanted Louis to embody Catholicism. Louis XIII was the king that placed France finally and firmly in the Catholic camp.

The ship of state is portrayed as a parade boat. Rubens references Horace’s boat, adorned with a dragon on the front and dolphins on the stern. Louis looks to his mother for guidance as he guides the ship. The four rowing figures personify Force, Religion, Justice and Concord. Force is recognizable by extending her oar, with the shield emblem of the lion and column. She is paired

______________________________


with Marie by hair color, and similarly Louis is paired with Religion by hair color. In both works, the *Apotheosis of James I* (A-10) and Rubens’s earlier work, *Louis XIII Comes of Age* (A-87), Religion’s identifying iconography is a flaming altar.

**Conclusion**

The importance of the religious themes, dear to Charles and to Rubens in the Banqueting House Ceiling has been understated. These themes, drawn from Catholic iconographical sources, are indebted to Lipsius, papal works, and works done for Catholic monarchs. They reflected absolutism and its intersection with religion. A more Christian context for the Banqueting House ceiling also helped the paintings at Whitehall serve as a cenotaph for James, a religious reminder and a statement about the founder of the dynasty. Charles certainly saw the Banqueting House cycle as such a memorial, not only to kingship but also to his father, just as the Rubens canvasses in France celebrated a decade earlier the father of his bride, Henrietta Maria. The Medici works provided a lasting memorial to a revered martyred king. The Stuart works did the same for England’s Solomon.
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Figure 6-1. *St. Katharine Cree*, East End of the Nave showing the Rose window with IHS monogram and Corinthian Columns in the redoes. Both date from the Laudian decorations. Photo by author.
Figure 6-2. Bernini, *Baldacchino*, 1624-33, Bronze on Marble Pedestals, height 93'6" Saint Peter's, Rome. Photo by author.
CHAPTER 7
CATHOLIC INFLUENCE AND ICONOGRAPHY IN ABSOLUTIST ART
IN CAROLINE ENGLAND

Introduction

This chapter presents evidence regarding Catholic influence and reaction to it in building and sculptural programs between 1618 and 1649. The analysis includes the major renovations at St. Paul’s Cathedral and a study of the renewal, including altar screens and other programs of art employed in various churches, cathedrals, and public displays. In addition, an examination of the royal image in sculpture and painting is explored, along with the influences and purposes for such programs. This chapter concludes with an analysis of proposed plans for a project in London that was remarkably similar to the Escorial in Madrid.

The Restoration of St. Paul’s and Catholic Influence

For almost 30 years the restoration of St. Paul’s was at the center of the Stuarts’ plans for a renovated London. This project was a result of three surveys: the first in 1608, another in 1620, and a final one in 1633. Each testified to the abuse and physical disrepair of St. Paul’s. 1 St. Paul’s renovation was of symbolic importance for James and Charles who attached religious authority to the old cathedral. The contemporary writer Dugdale wrote that St. Paul’s was “one of the principall ornaments of the Realm.” 2 He also added that St. Paul’s was “the impriall seat of this Realme.” 3 Even the Puritan Bishop John King, in a 1620 sermon, pointed out the

1 Vaughan Hart, Art and Magic in the Court of the Stuarts (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 44.


3 W. Dugdale, 138.
importance for the Stuart legacy of James’s proposed building program. His sermon noted a change in his attitude about building and decoration of churches. As pointed out in Chapter 3, in the 1610s, Bishop King criticized Laud for his “magnificent” decorative plans as dean. The evolution of Bishop King, in *A sermon at Paules Crosse, on behalfe of Paules Church, March 2, 1620*, gives an example of the changing mindset of clergy. King reflected in his sermon the policy of the Stuarts, which had moved toward the “beauty of holiness.” Bishop King had, to a certain degree, abandoned his Puritan tastes.

Your Citty hath beene anciently stiled *Augusta* . . . . Not weary mine eyes wandring and roving after private, but to fixe upon publicke alone . . . . your Royall Exchange for Merchants, your Halls for Companies, your gates for defence, your markets for victual, your aquaeducts for water, your granaries for provision, your Hospitalls for the poore, your Bridewells for the idle, your Chamber for Orphans, and your Churches for holy Assemblies: I cannot denie them to be magnificent workes, and your Citty to deserve the name of an *Agustious* and majesticall Citty.⁴

Priorities had changed in Stuart England. During the time of Elizabeth, cathedrals and churches had become dilapidated and were often used for secular purposes, their religious significance minimized. The Stuarts reversed this trend. The cathedral project, though cut short by the Civil War, would be the most important statement of Stuart politics and theological polity made by the dynasty.

The repair or actually the “conversion” of the old cathedral was also the most important commission offered to Inigo Jones. It was steeped in monarchical ambition and proclamations about how the Stuarts were transforming the English nation and faith. The renovations planned at St. Paul’s announced that the Stuarts had aspirations as defenders of the faith, as well as emperors of Great Britain. Vaughan Hart wrote that this work was for “proclaiming the imperial
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concept of Great Britain and the medieval myth of the British king as heirs of the French
throne.” He also added: “Indeed, the portico inscription itself praised Charles for his
‘restoration’ of the cathedral in fulfillment of his role as ‘Defender of the Faith.’”

This work was on a grand scale. In many ways, the project was as significant as the
building of the Escorial. The Escorial was a statement of spiritual renewal under Philip II and
was an imperial statement. As with Philip II, the Stuarts tried to express in St. Paul’s, as well as
in the thwarted plans for Whitehall, an imitation and what they viewed as improvement of the
Spanish work. The Whitehall plans, discussed at the end of this chapter, showed the same
intentions as the Spanish had already created in Charles’s own plans for a Temple of Solomon in
London. The plans included a massive royal chapel at its center, as did the Escorial.

The monarchy had a confirmed ally with the elevation of William Laud, Bishop King’s
successor, for St. Paul’s renewal. As bishop of London, William Laud helped to inaugurate the
long-needed repair of St. Paul’s Cathedral in 1631 (Figures 7-1, 7-2). A determined fund-raising
campaign was sustained even after Laud translated to Canterbury. He brought in more than
£100,000, and enabled the repair of the whole exterior of the cathedral from 1633 to 1641.
Charles I paid for the reconstruction of the west front. Jones was appointed surveyor in February
1633 and waived his fee. All three men sensed the importance of this work as a statement about
the “British empire rising in the west.” The fifteen volumes of detailed accounts kept by John
Webb as clerk of record noted the repairs of the project. Unfortunately, the building itself fell
victim to the great fire of 1666.
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Laud was a renovator from the start. Installed as Archbishop of Canterbury on September 19, 1633, he launched a restoration and redecoration of the chapel of Lambeth Palace. As a pastor, he had already begun renovations in other churches, which had put him at odds with Puritan bishops during the second decade of the 1600s. As archbishop, he was free to express his ideals of the “beauty of holiness” championed by the anti-Calvinist faction from the beginning of James’s reign.

The renewal of Lambeth Chapel was to provide an example and template for others to follow. The renovations were also a necessity. Laud found the chapel in a neglected condition, as was St. Paul’s. George Abbot’s primacy was a time of protracted decline in the maintenance of the church. Laud’s biographer, Peter Heylyn, reported that when Laud first came to Lambeth House he found the “Chappel lye so nastily . . . that he was much ashamed to see it, and could not resort unto it without disdain.” Heylyn also reported that the windows were defaced and all features were in disarray. Laud changed the chapel at Lambeth Palace into a place of beauty and dignity. Windows were reglazed and a new communion table was ordered and placed “shadowed overhead with a very fair Frieze, and fenced with a decent and costly Raile, the guilding of the one, and the curious workmanship of the other, together with the Table itself, amounting to 33 pounds and upwards.” Laud added rich altar-cloths, new communion plate, copes, and other vestments available to the chaplains. The organ repaired, Laud then borrowed men from the
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royal choir to accompany services.⁹ The chapel for the primate of the English Church was to reflect splendor, beauty in music, art, and dignity, along with a restored sacredness to worship. Both those who admired the changes and those who held them in disdain noticed the splendor.

Prynne noted in *Canterburies Doome* the furnishings and layout, though his purpose was not to document Laud’s work or magnificent ceremony but to expose his “popery.” Yet, we are indebted to this work as it gives a detailed explanation of the sources for the decoration of the chapel. The windows of the refurbished chapel described by Prynne included a crucifixion, with instruments of the passion, Abraham and Isaac, Christ as Judge of the world, Solomon, and David as judge. It also included windows with the Holy Ghost descending as a dove, Solomon with the queen of Sheba adoring him paired with the Wise Men adoring the Virgin and Child, and the Last Supper. The most idolatrous of all for Prynne was an unusual scene from Numbers where God was imaged as an old man who struck Miriam with leprosy.¹⁰ The passion windows at the east end of the chapel were taken from “the great Roman Missal or Mass Book” and were identified by Prynne along with many other Catholic books taken from the library after Laud’s arrest.¹¹ Laud used the Roman Missal and its illustrations as a template for images used in these windows. Knowing that he possessed such texts as the Missal, the similarity of his style of worship to Rome’s style is more than coincidental. The beauty and emphasis of the priestly ministry of the Tridentine Mass no doubt inspired Laud through its poetry, ceremony, reverence, and the expressed and “imaged” theological “beauty.” Prynne’s discovery of this text and many
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¹⁰ All details of the windows at Lambeth Chapel can be gleaned from *Canterburies Doome*, pages 59-62.

¹¹ Prynne used these books as evidence of Laud’s popery at his trial.
other Catholic devotionals confirms the growing tendency of High Church Anglicans in the 1620s and 1630s to turn to Catholic works for inspiration.

Lambeth was a prelude to the greater ambitions of Laud. The restoration of St. Paul’s to a living cathedral again was his lifelong pursuit. As the most prominent building in the city of London, its renovation occupied Laud’s life for more than ten years. As with Lambeth Palace, St. Paul’s was nearly in ruins. The Gothic spire was destroyed by lightning in 1561 and not rebuilt. It was in such poor condition, and so encroached with secular life, that its religious use was nearly obliterated. It was comprehensively neglected in Elizabeth’s reign, as church fabric had been neglected during her rule. As early as 1608, James made a halfhearted appeal for repairs and then again, with more purpose in 1620, as it appeared a Spanish princess would be moving to London. However, like much of the Jacobean period, this was also left for James’s successor to implement.12

In 1633, Charles wrote to Laud promising to pay for the entire west front himself, over and above his existing gifts.13 Laud himself spent over £1,200.14 He and many other Arminians and anti-Calvinists, like the Catholic Church, valued such efforts as good works. They could be a means to salvation. Bishop Gyles Fleming urged the support of the project as an important

13 John Harris and Gordon Higgott, 238.
14 William Laud, William Laud: The history of the troubles and tryal of the Most Reverend Father in God and blessed martyr, William Laud, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury wrote by himself during his imprisonment in the Tower ; to which is prefixed the diary of his own life, faithfully and entirely published from the original copy ; and subjoined, a supplement to the preceding history, the Arch-Bishop's last will, his large answer to the Lord Say's speech concerning liturgies, his annual accounts of his province delivered to the king, and some other things relating to the history (London: Printed for Ri. Chiswell at the Rose and Crown in St. Paul’s Churchyard, 1695), 244.
opportunity for salvation by works, which showed one’s faith.\textsuperscript{15} This attitude was anathema for Puritans. One of the previous bishops of London, George Montaigne, was a most important ally for church decoration in that he encouraged the adoration and erection of images in churches. He preached this subject at St. Paul’s Cross and contributed a large sum of money for the Portland stone used in the new construction. In contrast, Puritans and parishes controlled by Puritan ministers did little toward repair. Because the vocabulary used by the Laudians was so similar to, if not indistinguishable from, Catholicism.

In the stages of the planned restoration, Roman Catholic influence can be seen in the unexecuted design for the west front of St. Paul’s, where Jones incorporated angels and saints. The saints were most likely the patrons of the church, Peter and Paul. This design used a prominent IHS monogram (A-84). This monogram was most offensive to the Puritans. \textit{Jesus Hominum Salvator} was the most prominent Jesuit symbol of the Counter-Reformation. George Henderson pointed out that Laud owned Bible illustrations, which incorporated the IHS sunburst that ultimately proved grounds for Puritan censure.\textsuperscript{16} Indeed, the arch-Puritan William Prynne saw the IHS monogram as “but an undoubted Badge, and Character of a Popish, and Jesuiticall Booke: of an Idolatrous and Romish Devotion.”\textsuperscript{17} The use of such a symbol prominently on a


\bibitem{prynne1560} William Prynne, \textit{A briefe suruay and censure of Mr Cozens his couzening devotions Prouing both the forme and matter of Mr Cozens his booke of priuate devotions, or the howres of prayer, lately published, to be meerely popish: to differ from the priuate prayers authorized by Queene Elizabeth 1560. to be transcribed out of popish authors, with which they are here paralelled: and to be scandalous and preiudicall to our Church, and aduantagious onely to the
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Protestant cathedral was meant to celebrate a coming together of England and her possible Catholic political allies. Per Palme demonstrated that the Banqueting House was built in the early 1620s because of James’s inclinations toward a Spanish match.\(^{18}\) This earlier design of St. Paul’s also fit this political effort. If the Infanta had come to London, as proposed in the early 1620s, the use of a Jesuit symbol on the cathedral would have been a comforting sight for the Spanish. As we now know, the visit never happened and the project was put off for more than ten more years. Though the Jesuit IHS in starburst was not used, it is remarkable that the use of such a symbol was contemplated at all. The religious polity of the court was clearly moving away from further reform and toward the dominant religious and artistic sensibilities of the time in Europe--Catholicism.

The renovations finally came to fruition. The project began with four cornerstones laid in 1633, and an “ecumenical” feel could be seen to the dedication. Four officials took part in the laying of these symbols of the cathedral’s resurrection.

The said Bishop…layd the first stone at the East end therof: The second stone being then layd by Sir Francis Windibank Knight, one of his Majesties principall Secretaries of State; the third by Sir Henry Martin, then judge of the Perogative Court; and the fourth by the before specified Inigo Jones, Surveyor generall of this work.\(^{19}\)

---

\(^{18}\) Per Palme’s argument, set up in his chapter “Preparations for a Goddess,” 7-39 in *Triumph of Peace: A study of the Whitehall Banqueting House*. This chapter clearly explained the purpose of the Banqueting House as a way to celebrate James’s proposed Anglo-Catholic alliance with Spain. Ambitions toward a religious unity were expressed in the harmony of the orders used at the new hall.

\(^{19}\) William Dugdale, *The history of St. Pauls Cathedral in London from its foundation untill these times extracted out of originall charters, records, leiger books, and other manuscripts : beautified with sundry prospects of the church, figures of tombes and monuments* (London: Tho. Warren, 1658), 139.
Two people laying the cornerstones at the cathedral were Catholics, Inigo Jones and Francis Windibank, whose son Edward died at the Battle of the Boyne in 1690 on the side of King James II.  

The “ecumenical” influence of Laud is reflected in the ornamentation of the cathedral, including the colored glass. Much of the stained glass from the Catholic period of the cathedral still existed, and the Jacobeans improved it. John Stow noted that in 1620 James examined “three great Windowes newly glazed, in rich colours, with the story of Saint Paul.” Stow also noticed that the interior was “painted with rich colours in Oyle.” Dugdale relayed that the interior was decorated in 1633, before the outside.

Sir Paul Pinder… having at his own charge, first repaired the decays of that goodly partition, made at the West end of the Quire; adorning the font thereof, outwards, with fair Pillars of black Marble, and Statues of those Saxon Kings, which had been Founders, or Benefactors to the Church; beautified the inner part thereof, with figures of Angells; and all the wainscote work of the Quire, with excellent carving; viz of Cherubins and other Imagery, richly gilded; adding costly suits of Hangings for the upper end thereof. According to Dugdale, most of this decoration was for the enhancement and replacement of the choir screen, which featured the Catholic Saxon kings.

---


21 Horace Walpole and the majority of Jones’s biographers stated he was a Roman Catholic. This comes from George Virtue’s notebooks: “Dr Harwood from S. Christ. Wren says that Inigo Dy’d at Somerset House in the Strand, a Roman Catholick, that he was put apprentice to a joiner in Paul’s church yard.” See Walpole Society Publications, vol. 18; Vertue Note Books, vol. I, (1930): 105.


23 John Stow, 767.

24 William Dugdale, 140.
The rejuvenation of the choir scene at St. Paul’s gave evidence to a changing theological climate in Stuart England with a renewed emphasis on the Eucharist. In the Laudian service, the altar replaced the Calvinist pulpit as the focal point of worship.25 From the existing plans left by Hollar, the altar was against the east wall and rose up four steps (A-97). Laud replaced the old altar pulled down during the iconoclasm of the 1550s. This change not only argued for but also demonstrated the importance and sanctity of the altar positioned at the east end of the cathedral. It appealed to pre-Reformation tradition. Laud insisted that the Garter Knights continue the custom of reverence toward the altar at the order’s ceremonies, a leftover from the Catholic period.26 He also revived the custom of reverence for the Eucharist in other services. The re-positioning of the altar in the sanctuary also enhanced processions. These changes were made earlier at Durham Cathedral, which was also a ceremonial template for Laud’s liturgies. In many respects, Laud was trying to outdo the papists in a show of veneration and respect.27 So the question remains: What were Laud and Charles’s greater intentions for these enhanced and “Romish” services and decorations in churches and cathedrals?

The King and Archbishop were trying to rival the magnificence of Rome, Madrid, and Paris. However, they were also trying to restore the beauty and dignity to the Church of England that had been missing, to a certain extent, after the reform. Beauty of worship, decoration, and the dignity and position of the clergy had been under attack in England from the beginning of the


Reformation. These attacks came ironically and often from other clergy. Laud and Charles read the history of British Christianity, as well as European Christianity, quite differently from extreme Calvinist Protestants. This program then necessitated a reestablished link to traditions that were also linked to Catholicism.

To this end, both king and bishop adopted the notion of imperial monarchy in relation to the ancient and medieval church, hence the inclusion of Catholic Saxon kings in the decorative design of altar screens. This was allowable because the Laudians’ general view of history was in essence conciliatory to the Church of Rome. It stressed a common inheritance from primitive Christianity onward through the middle ages. James and Charles, their most supportive bishops, Andrewes and Laud, and the other anti-Calvinists, hoped that a common history and similar practice could provide a fertile foundation for unification of Christianity, even with Rome. Most Laudians, as with both Stuart monarchs, believed that Rome had equal status as a true church. This was especially noted in Bishop Richard Montague’s attitude. Montague described Charles in 1636 as renewing, restoring, and repairing ancient rites to the church.28

Church reunification was not central in any way to Calvinism’s theological core doctrines. Calvinist doctrine stressed historical opposition to Rome and its “demonic domination” by bishops and popes. Most Puritan clergy and adherents defended a distinctly different concept of church from that of the Laudians. They were the heirs of Foxe and Jewel, and a group of reformers who traced the “true” church through medieval heretics like the Waldensians and Albigensians. For the Puritan clergy and elect the papacy was the anti-Christ predicted in the Book of Revelations. The pope was absolute evil, a modern reincarnation of the serpent in the garden who seduced people through liturgies, art, and all “magical” trickery and lies.

---

28 Nicholas Tyacke, 239.
On the other hand, Charles, Laud, and the anti-Calvinists’ views of history were quite different. Laud and others with like minds were heirs to Hooker and Andrewes. The church was a continuous institution, vindicated by tradition and reason. The Roman Church, even in its present corruption, was a true part of the entire church. Laud, Andrewes, and most of the other anti-Calvinists had no use for Jewel or Foxe and their view of the history of Christianity. This was history of, by, and through heretics. The anti-Calvinists celebrated the church fathers, Latin and Greek, along with the traditions of the Middle Ages. These traditions were what Laud sought to revive as a legitimate Christian inheritance.  

Certainly, Laud and Charles would have known and acknowledged that England had even produced a pope, Adrian IV, who essentially gave Ireland to the English Crown in the 1150s. Much was to be esteemed in the common ground of the past with Roman Catholicism.

It is true that some of the Laudians were anti-papist, but they did not believe the pope to be the devil incarnate. They felt he was in error, especially about the nature of royal government. Laudians were almost to a man supporters of royal Absolutism; however, they did not believe that the king had any priestly authority. James did allow an anti-papery rhetoric during his reign, which was useful for James until his obsession with a Catholic match became the center of his foreign policy. Unfortunately, the short-term gains of anti-papery in James’s political and religious inconsistency helped to further the divide in the English Church during his reign and served as a basis for much of the anti-Catholic propaganda and anti-Laudian resentment, which emerged during the reign of Charles. 

29 Hugh Trevor-Roper, 143.

St. Paul’s was a concrete embodiment of Laudianism’s appeal to the Catholic past. Moderate Laudians, such as the Lincolnshire priest Gyles Fleming, who wrote *Magnificence Exemplified: and the Repair of Saint Paul’s exhorted unto* (1634), continued to emphasize a connection to the Catholic past. This sermon exemplified the Laudian policy toward beauty in holiness and was in all its aspects propaganda for the repair of the cathedral. Fleming exhorted his congregation to donate to St. Paul’s because it is the “mother of Cathedrals” in England. Once again, attachment to the past—exemplified by ornamentation on the interior as well as the exterior—established an anti-Puritan view of the church’s past and its future. Hugh Trevor-Roper wrote:

The restoration of St. Paul’s, even if, considering the design according to which it was to be restored, it cannot be called beautification—was a striking instance in the aesthetic sphere of the Catholic culture, which Charles I and Laud were seeking to impose, as a stabilizing mould, upon a society suffering from the disintegrating effects of change. The motives which inspired them were not identical, for Laud look upon the arts in a more utilitarian spirit, as the external forms by which men were drawn to support of a given system, but they operated in the same direction . . . It was not because Laud himself had artistic tastes that he fostered some of the arts, nor because he was himself an Orientalist that he patronized Oriental studies; but, like the statesman who founded libraries and academies, he understood the social value of these things.”

Jones also showed this social value in the design of the outer cathedral.

As noted earlier, the social value and connection of the art in the interior and exterior of the cathedral was designed for not only edification, but also education. According to a drawing based on the original plans by William Kent, the great portico was to have the most important
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31 Gyles Fleming, *Magnificence exemplified: and, the repaire of Saint Pauls exhorted*, 42-44.

kings of England standing on the entrance to the cathedral on the portico. However, the west front of the Cathedral ended up with only statues of Charles and James. The front of the portico, inscribed in Latin, CAROLUS D.G MAGNAE BRITANNIAE HIBERNIAE FRANCIAE REX F.D. TEMPULUM SANCTI PAULI VETUSTATE CONSUMPTUM RESTITUIT ET PORTICUM FECIT, proclaims Charles as the restorer of St. Paul’s and the builder of the portico. Charles is connected full circle to the Catholic Saxon kings on the screen inside the church and Charles is the noble successor of the past, kingship, and true piety.

The similarities to Catholic precursors in Italy for St. Paul’s design are undeniable. The walls of the Romanesque transepts and nave were re-cased to a new, classical design, and at the west end Jones constructed an entirely new ten-column Corinthian portico. The re-cased walls were completely rusticated. Fenestration consisted of oculi above round-head windows, and pineapples capped pilaster buttresses. The cornice was of a quasi-Doric design, apparently derived from Hieronymus Cock’s reconstruction of the baths of Diocletian (1558) which Jones saw in Rome. The transept doorways were Ionic, and the Corinthian portico completed the gamut of the orders. Jones relied heavily on Counter-Reformation buildings favored by Jesuits. Such churches as San Ambrogio, Genoa (A-83) and Il Gesu, the mother church of the Jesuits in Rome, with its prominent IHS monogram (Figure 5-2), were inspirations in preliminary drawings and in the final design.

The decision to resurface St. Paul’s with a classical façade was an expression of the dismissal of the Gothic by Jones and the Stuarts. Henry Wotton echoed Giorgio Vasari’s famous criticism of Gothic as barbaric. Gothic “ought to bee exiled from judicious eyes, and left to their

33 See John Harris and Gordon Higgott, page 238, for Kent’s drawing.
first inventors, the Gothes or Lumbards, amongst other Reliques of that barbarous Age.”

Clearly, Laud and Charles approved of the use of classical vocabulary. The classic portico type, a full-width colonnade carrying not a pediment but a balustraded platform, was once again familiar to Jones from Palladio’s illustrations of antique temples, specifically, the temple of Venus and in Rome the temple of Peace (Basilica of Maxentius-Constantine). His annotations in his copy of Palladio showed how Jones thought such a structure could embody what he called “the Romain Greatnes.” He also saw the Pantheon, dedicated as Santa Maria dei martiri (Figure 4-1), a church converted from the so-called Temple of Castor, Pollux in Naples (A-54), and The Temple of Antoninus and Faustina (Figure 7-3) with massive Corinthian columns on their porticoes.

Webb noted the magnificence of the restoration was to be a religious statement of purpose to show to the world that “the Envy of all Christendom upon our Nation, for a Piece of Architecture, not to be parallel’d in these last Ages of the World.” Dugdale also hailed the portico as a celebration of “Catholic” royalty, international as well as national Christian virtue.

The function of the portico, according to William Dugdale, was “to be an ambulatory for such, as usually by walking in the body of the Church disturbed the solemn service in the

---


35 John Webb, A vindication of Stone-Heng restored in which the orders and rules of architecture observed by the ancient Romans are discussed: together with the customs and manners of several nations of the world in matters of building of greatest antiquity: as also, an historical narration of the most memorable actions of the Danes in England. (London: by James Bettenham for G. Conyers, J. and B. Sprint, B. Lintot, D. Browne junior, J. Woodman and D. Lyon, 1725), 27.

36 William Dugdale, 140.
Quire.” The church was to return to a traditional “sacred space” rather than a place of commerce. Before Laud’s time it was noted,

   The noise in it is like that of bees, a strange humming or buzz mixed of walking tongues and feet: it is a kind of still roar . . it is the thieves sanctuary, which rob more safely in a crowd than in a wilderness . . . It is the other expense of the day, after plays, tavern and bawdy-house; and men have still some oaths left to swear here.  

People used Paul’s Walk, as it was called, to gossip, display fashions, and do business. As far as the king and Laud were concerned, this was going to end, and the cathedral was to become a place of dignity once more for sacred purpose. For many Puritans, St. Paul’s was only a building connected with the “heretical” Catholic past. It was suitable only for doing business or stabling horses, which they did during the Civil War.

**Sculpture and the Use of Catholic Sources for Political Propaganda**

Though not rebuilt like St. Paul’s, Westminster Abbey was a steady contributor in the development of ceremonialism and royal propaganda. It was a special repository of anti-Calvinist and Laudian values. Julia Merritt, in her publication on polity and practice in the abbey after the Reformation, noted that it was indeed “the cradle of Laudianism.” The abbey, as the site of the burial of kings and of coronations, had exceptional status as a royal peculiar, completely under the control of the monarch. Thus, it was a showcase for the crown’s theological and political programs. However, unlike the royal chapel, it was a much more public building, open to all. Merritt noted the crown appointed the deans and they were conservative. Gabriel Goodman (dean, 1561-1601) is the first example given. He was educated during Queen

---

37 William Dugdale, 106.


Mary I’s reign, and it seems his conservative nature was the only reason he was continually
passed up for vacant Dioceses during Elizabeth’s reign. During his tenure as dean, the abbey
missed a whole generation of the zealous Elizabethan Calvinist reform. Goodman presided over
services that were pre-Reformation in their high degree of ceremony, including the use of
vestments, canopies, plate, and altar cloths. Due to his stewardship, tapestries survived which
told the life of Christ through the life of Edward the Confessor. In addition, the statues at the
abbey were left alone, unlike those in many other sanctuaries that endured periodic iconoclasm.

The followers of Goodman were all influential contributors to the “beauty of holiness.”
Lancelot Andrewes was dean from 1601 to 1605, then Richard Neile from 1605 to 1610,
followed by George Montaigne. Finally, John Williams took over the position from 1620 until
the Civil War. Andrewes improved the choir and ensured the services followed the entire liturgy
of the Prayer Book. Neile repaired the high altar and inner fabric. Williams was the most
energetic. He restored the interior and rebuilt the buttresses outside “which he beautified with
elegant Statues” including one of the final abbot before the dissolution of the monastery, Islip.
Williams himself spent 4500 pounds to beautify this edifice, but did so anonymously. The
services during William’s tenure were also extremely formal and reflected a High Church
mentality.

Noted earlier in this study was the significance of the royal tombs. The abbey was also the
most important place for new memorials to other Stuart nobility. At Westminster Abbey, royal

---

40 Julia Merritt, 627-628.
41 Julia Merritt, 631.
chapels, tombs, and artwork were maintained in excellent condition, unlike the considerable
decay of such items in many churches and cathedrals. These tombs were placed at the eastern
end of the abbey in the Lady Chapel. As was tradition, the eastern end was the most “sacred”
part of the church, close to its sacramental center. James chose to be buried in a relatively
unmarked grave almost directly under the High Altar near his Catholic ancestor Henry VII.

Most of the images the Stuarts produced at Westminster, with its stone virtues, angels, and
cherubs, were distasteful to Puritans. The combination of royal tombs and elaborate services in
the newly beautified choir and exterior gave evidence of continuity with pre-Reformation
traditions and the abbey’s Catholic history. It should be noted that the artwork and liturgies
performed in the abbey were in step with Catholic Counter-Reformation contemporary practice.

In the abbey, James was the first king since Henry VII to combine state portraiture with
religious symbolism in his memorial to his mother, Mary Queen of Scots. Charles continued this
practice in such works as the Banqueting House. For many Calvinist critics of the regime, it
clearly crossed that “line” and seemed closer to “popery” than to “godly” religion. Puritans
preferred Elizabeth’s propaganda to that of the Stuarts. This replaced the oldest Christian
symbol, the crucifix in many churches with the Queen’s coat of arms. Stuart Kings went one-step
further. They placed their statues on the altar screen, where statues of Christ, the Madonna, and
saints had once stood. This placing of the monarchs at center of worship space was exemplified
in another very public construction of a new screen at Winchester Cathedral.

Jones designed a new choir screen for Winchester Cathedral that showed the close link
between the church and crown. This construction was suggested after Charles visited the church
in progress during 1636. He commented on the state of decay of the cathedral, especially the
screen, pulpit and other important furnishings seemingly left to “rot.” Laud, with the help of
Matthew Wren, bishop of Ely, who informed Laud of the king’s remarks, persuaded the dean and chapter to replace the ruined screen with one worthy of a cathedral. One of the main reasons for attention to this specific cathedral was that many Saxon kings were buried at Winchester. This had been a royal abbey before the Reformation.

Jones’s screen, designed from 1637 to 1638, is notable as an example of other screens built during the Laudian period. These screens were intended to sanctify the chancel and to form a barrier that created a “church within a church.” The interior was for the sacrament and the nave for sermonizing. Hollar’s plans for St. Paul’s (A-97, A-98, A-99) recorded steps up to the chancel, which further distinguished the nave from the chancel. This was intended to emphasize the sacramental, sacred, and priestly nature of the sanctuary. The statues of the Stuart kings at Winchester Cathedral were placed on either side of the opening to the chancel (A-100, A-101), similar to statues placed at the entrance of the abbey church in the Escorial.

At the Escorial, in the entrance to the basilica of San Lorenzo, Pompeo Leoni made bronze statues of the Hapsburgs. These effigies show Charles V and Family on the Gospel side and Philip II and Family on the Epistle side (A-15). Though too massive to be attached to an altar screen, the statues that Charles saw at the Escorial served the same function. They reminded those who came to the Basilica church at Escorial of the kings’ piety and connections to the church as protectors of religion. Jones seemed to have had the same idea in mind with the installation of large statues on the screen (A-100) designed by Le Sueur.

The church was not the only place for display. Charles I brought monumental imperial sculpture to England for the first time in an over life-sized equestrian statue by Le Sueur (Figure 7-1). This was an imitation of great statuary and painting Charles saw in Paris and in Madrid. A

43 G. Addleshaw and F. Etchells, 42.
prime example of this is the Titian painting of *Charles V on Horseback* (A-102). Charles Stuart was one of the most energetic monarchs in his use of statuary during the 1630s. Contrary to what earlier historians have stated, he also displayed art, in particular sculpture, in many public places. This display of quasi-religious artwork was part of his program to bolster his right to rule and command respect. Previous or contemporary examples of this type of display were in Catholic countries. Charles used this art as a template for display.

In the 1620s and 1630s, Charles went on an extensive program of buying and commissioning sculptures. Charles’s love of sculpture dates to his childhood. In 1611, Henry Prince of Wales was presented with examples of fashionable sculpture. These included fifteen table bronzes from the workshop of Giambologna and were part of the negotiations for a marriage between Henry and Catherina de’ Medici, sister of Cosmo II. These child-sized bronzes were critical in awakening the appreciation of sculpture in the future king.

Even before he became king, Charles was a moving figure in approaching Pietro Tacca to cast the planned bronze equestrian monument to James I. It was never realized, but the intention was to put the Stuarts on the same level as the Medici and the Bourbons, who already had such images of their monarchs. Only a few years after the project to get Tacca to cast the equestrian work of James I, Charles acquired virtually all the statues of the Mantua Court.

---


45 Charles Avery, 103.

Mantua was famous for its patronage of the visual arts and especially its collection of great religious paintings. For Charles, collecting was not an end in itself.

As king, Charles was not only a connoisseur, but also an iconic entrepreneur. One of the disadvantages of the splendid and eloquent paintings he collected or commissioned was their inability to be displayed outside for a more general audience. In contrast, his sculptures could be and were displayed in very public places. During a time when access to royal palaces was confined to the highborn, privileged or rich (many who were for the most part also collectors of art), the king’s sculptures could be used outside of his personal sphere as an extension of his presence. Sculpture could expose the idea of the king, to rich and poor, sympathetic and disaffected alike. This may be why Charles valued the works of second-rate sculptors as highly as he did the works of consummate masters. Sculpture had a propaganda value that paintings could never have.

The rhetoric of sculpture was useful to Charles. The rituals of the English coronation rite enhanced the deistic message and image of the king. For Charles, sculpture was an art of eloquence and proportion that supported this message of divinely inspired monarchy. It was also for him a means of persuasion in a society in ways that are difficult for us to grasp in our modern and relatively art-free world, at least free of art whose direct intent is to communicate something universal about anything in particular.

In this light, Henry Wotton’s thought about art, sculpture in particular, reminds today’s viewer of the intended audience. Monuments were not “a bare and transitory entertainment of the Eye…But had also a secret and strong influence, even into the Advancement of the Monarchy, by continual representation of virtuous examples, so as in that point, Art became a piece of
This was something Charles counted on being true and ‘readable’ by his people, in his building programs, decoration of churches, and sculpture.

Charles’s collections were also available to those who wanted to study them. The sculptures from Mantua particularly affected local sculptors. Nicholas Stone became involved as restorer as soon as they were unloaded. Stone restored some marble pieces damaged in the crossing. Undertaking the restoration work of these statues allowed for a close contact with these classical and Catholic religious sculptures. The Mantuan works were the nucleus of the royal collection. They had a profound effect on the development of Charles’s taste and his notion of what sculpture could do to propagandize his absolutist notions. This collection inspired and challenged him.

Charles became the most active of royal patrons using sculpture in Europe during the 1630s. He became even more absorbed by works in Italy, which were not for sale, though this did not stop him from trying to purchase them. Charles’s appreciation and awareness of the propaganda value of these works led to attempts to acquire the most famous statues in Rome. When attempts to purchase failed, he sent Gage. This Catholic “exile” then returned as papal legate a few years later. A reengagement with Rome allowed Le Sueur to go to Rome to cast moulds of famous works, such as the Borghese Gladiator. These reproductions then were brought back to London and elsewhere for display.

Le Sueur copied some famous works, including the Antinoos of Belvedere, the Farnese Hercules, the Borghese Gladiator and Spinario. These virtuous ruler archetypes of antiquity

47 Per Palme, Triumph of Peace, 267.


49 Charles Avery, 149.
were displayed outside the Stuart palaces in their gardens and public places to enhance the notion that Charles was an equal of the great royalty of Europe.\textsuperscript{50} Even in this display, Charles was indebted to Catholic royalty, such as the Medici, Hapsburgs, Bourbons, and the papacy, who would not part with their precious pieces, but allowed Charles to have them copied. Second-rate reproductions made by Le Sueur, with the permission of Catholic monarchs, sufficed. Even though Le Sueur’s copies were not exceptional, he made many. Le Sueur had fifty commissions alone in less than twenty years. Though Le Sueur’s works could rarely inspire, as did the works of Bernini, he was adequate for Charles’s propaganda purposes. In addition, he was reliable, and Le Sueur’s output was continuous, reaching a climax in the late 1630s.

By the early 1630s, Charles and Henrietta Maria were active patrons of sculptors, possibly the most active at this time.\textsuperscript{51} During this period, Henrietta Maria had grand reredos in stone and paint done by Francois Dieussart. These “Glories of Angels” were placed in her chapel at Denmark House.\textsuperscript{52} At the same time, Stone and Le Sueur made two separate fountains crowned by statues of Arethusa and Mercury for the gardens at Denmark House.\textsuperscript{53} These works are related to the Honthorst painting of \textit{Apollo and Diana} (A-91) in which Buckingham was Mercury, who led the seven liberal arts to pay homage to the king and queen.

\textsuperscript{50} Charles Avery, 149.

\textsuperscript{51} Art historians should conduct a study to see what the sculpture output of Charles and Henrietta Maria was during the personal rule, comparing the output to other contemporary courts. It would allow a comparison of the enormous number of commissions of Charles to other significant monarchies in the 1630s.


The most constant demand on sculptors, and in particular on Le Sueur, was for royal busts and full-sized statues. These are somewhat monotonous, but reveal attitudes about sculpture and the prototypes Charles preferred. Many busts included significant iconography, which spoke of Charles’s intentions. Charles was often in an antique helmet, some with dragon crests, as Charles had been portrayed in *St. George* by Rubens (A-96). Most busts showed the king in armor and were displayed in public places.

Portsmouth, where Charles landed after returning from the Spanish marriage debacle in 1623, was privileged to have one of the king’s images. Chichester was another place for a display of a Le Sueur bust. St. Paul’s Hammersmith also displayed a bust of Charles I by Le Sueur. Two busts by Le Sueur were at the Banqueting House, one of Charles installed above the door and a colossal bust of James I placed outside the entrance, opposite Charles’s bust.  

More importantly were full-sized statues of Charles, often paired with James I or Henrietta Maria. Laud inspired one famous pair. In 1636, Laud was at the summit of his prosperity as Archbishop and Chancellor of Oxford. He placed full-length Le Sueur statues of Charles and Henrietta Maria in niches on the east-west axis wall of the Canterbury Quadrangle at Oxford.  

Charles, shortly after seeing these works in progress, commissioned Le Sueur to make several more life-sized bronzes of himself, James and Henrietta Maria. These were placed in prominent positions in London and Westminster. Many were destroyed after the king’s execution.

---


The most conspicuous was a statue of Charles that was paired with James I at the Royal Exchange. This statue was decapitated in a “macabre and symbolic re-run of his execution” by the order of Parliament.56 The order read that the bronze of the king was “to be demolished, by having the head taken off, and the scepter out of his hand, and this inscription to be written ‘Exit tyrannus Regum ultimus, anno primo restitutae libertatis Angliae 1648’, and this to be done between this and Saturday next.”57 This order, carried out, made a poignant statement, which remained during the Commonwealth.

Other full-sized statues were in Covent Garden. St. Paul’s Covent Garden was the first completely new church built on a new site after the Reformation. It therefore demanded the presence of the Defender of the Faith. Statues of the king and queen stood “before what to some was the only true Protestant church in London, and in front of the most elegant and commodious square in his kingdom.”58 Less friendly gentry, including Lord Bedford, controlled the Covent Garden works project. By putting his statue there in the complex, Charles made his presence felt. Bedford, one of the prominent Puritan Lords, did not associate with Charles or the court because Bedford suspected the king’s motives and particularly the king’s religion. Martin Butler noted:

It [the Covent Garden development] was also a challenge to Laud’s conforming ministry. The Covent Garden church was the first church to be built in London since the Reformation and the puritan earl reserved the patronage to himself, resisting the attempts of the vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields to control the living.59


Charles wanted to have his presence felt in a disloyal and alien environment, making a statement, that toleration of Puritanism went only so far. The king was king--even here. Other important areas of London, such as Queen Street, received full-length statues of the king and queen. Queen Street was one of the most fashionable areas of the capital and was inhabited by courtiers who included Sir Kenelm Digby and the Earl of Northumberland. Iconoclasts destroyed these statues, too, perhaps because of the well-known influence Henrietta Maria had on these decorative programs.

In the past, too little scholarly attention has been given to the considerable influence Henrietta Maria had on design at court. For instance, Henrietta Maria, rather than Charles, is now credited with using the royal gardens as “theaters” for sculpture. Andre Mollet was brought over to work at St. James’s Palace through Henrietta Maria’s connection with her family in France. Mollet’s father, Claude the Elder, had created the celebrated gardens for Henri IV, which had a distinctly French taste to what Henrietta Maria had the Younger Mollet construct in London. A French nobleman noted the similarities to Italianate gardens and display in London on a visit. The Sieur de la Serre, who was in the entourage of Marie de’ Medici in 1637, noted that the gardens of London were “where one may see the rarest wonders of Italy in great number of stone and bronze.”

---

60 David Howarth, “Charles I, Sculpture and Sculptors,” 93.


62 Roy Strong, 83-84, 187-188.

63 Roy Strong, 188.
The sheer number of statues displayed in London and other royal residences and public places during the Caroline period are staggering. The manuscript copies of the sale inventories do not exactly tell one where these statues were displayed, however, they testify to enormous numbers produced, bought, and displayed by Charles and his wife. “There were 177 statues, 227 busts, of which twenty seven were Le Sueur’s bronze ‘philosophers,’ eight reliefs, six terms, one urn, twenty-one loose pedestals, six blocks of marble, one ‘fragment’ and of broken figure 6 of plaster 4 of wax.”64 These were only a portion of statues from the king and queen’s possessions that went on sale after the demise of Charles.

The first monumental bronze mentioned in this chapter was Charles I on Horseback by Le Sueur (Figure 7-1). This figure and the bronze at the exchange would become symbols of the return of the monarchy. By the spring of 1660, almost universal sympathy arose toward the martyred figure of Charles I. In March 1660, Major Henshaw informed the Earl of Clarendon “last evening the detestable motto on the Exchange under the last king’s statue was expunged by the city painter.”65 A poem by Edmund Waller expressed a reverence again found for the monarchy. This poem was an ironic commentary upon the king’s love of sculpture. It muses about the equestrian work by Le Sueur.

That the first Charles does here in triumph ride,  
See his son reign where he a martyr died,  
And people pay that reverence as they pass,  
(Which then he wanted!) to the sacred brass,  
Is not the effect of gratitude alone,  
To which we owe the statue and the stone;  
But heaven this lasting monument has wrought,  
That mortals may eternally be taught  
Rebellion, though successful, is but vain,

64 David Howarth, “Charles I, Sculpture and Sculptors,” 105.

65 David Howarth, 108.
And kings so killed rise conquerors again.
This truth the royal image does proclaim,
Loud as the trumpet of surviving fame.\textsuperscript{66}

This poem was written only a few years after the restoration. The poet Edmund Waller understood what Charles I was trying to achieve for the monarchy through art: respect, reverence, and cooperation, but too late.

\textbf{Image of Catholic Monarchy: Gianlorenzo Bernini and Charles I}

Gianlorenzo Bernini was one of the most sought-after and important artists of the Baroque. This giant of Italian design, sculpture, and painting worked for seven popes and numerous kings, queens, and princes throughout the Catholic world. One of the most celebrated episodes in Bernini’s career was his work for Charles I. The English commission was realized only through the papal connection through France and in particular because of the good relationship of the papal court with Henrietta Maria.\textsuperscript{67} Charles’s bust was the first bust Bernini executed for someone outside the orbit of Rome. This bust made Charles I the first ruler to have himself immortalized by the world’s dominant artistic figure from the world’s artistic capital. Eventually, Cardinal Richelieu, Duke Francesco I d’Este, and Louis XIV would follow Charles’s lead in engaging Bernini for such a portrait bust. It struck admirers as having the same kind of energy and originality as Rubens’s works, already on display at court.

Bernini’s fame had already come to England. One of his designed works was in the queen’s collection. English cognoscenti saw this example of Bernini’s brilliance in a reliquary, designed and installed in one of the queen’s chapels one year before the bust arrived. Executed


\textsuperscript{67} Charles Avery, \textit{Bernini Genius of the Baroque} (London: Thames and Hudson), 1997, 225.
by Francesco Spagna, but designed by Bernini, the reliquary contained relics of St. Helena. George Conn brought it from Rome in the summer of 1636 as a gift for Henrietta Maria from the pope.  

Bernini fashioned for Charles in his bust an ideal of a Catholic monarch: divine, virtuous, and imperious, attributes Bernini already had done for the papacy. Charles I wanted the artist’s talents used for the same reasons. He wanted an image by the great artist to display at court, which would rival other images fashioned for kings, popes, and important churchmen. Having Bernini’s work would announce that England was one of the greatest courts in Europe.

One of the most important art historians of the twentieth century, Irving Lavin, demonstrated that celebrated ruler portraits by Bernini should be regarded as related to the early modern political theory of anti-Machiavellianism, which countered Machiavelli’s self-serving advice to rulers with Christian political theory. The intent of princes and prelates alike was to portray themselves as noble Christian monarchs and models of rule. Lavin noted the current scholarship about anti-Machiavellianism, but also Lavin looks to earlier scholars such as Friedrich Meinecke and Rodolfo De Mattei.  

68 David Howarth, “Charles I Sculpture and Sculptors”, 95.


70 An entire school of thought exists on this subject. Major scholars are indebted to the writings of Friedrich Meinecke, Machiavellianism: The Doctrine of Raison d’Etat and its Place in Modern History, 1927. Most important in this study is the work of Robert Bireley, The Counter-Reformation Prince (Raleigh, N. C. 1990). He summed up the main ideas and scholarship in this work that support the notion that during the Counter-Reformation many princes tried to change the now commonly-held views of the corruption of monarchy and church by portraying the prince and prelate as noble, virtuous, anti-Machiavellian figures.
this Catholic theology into stone and paint. When one sees the similar connection that Rubens had with noted Catholic anti-Machiavellians such as Lipsius, Lavin’s argument is strengthened.

Lavin pointed out that Jesuits were among the strongest opponents of Machiavelli’s view of the prince. The Jesuits sought to provide an alternative to Machiavelli’s model of a world that was unscrupulous and cynical in statecraft (though at times some Jesuits certainly lapsed into Machiavelli’s model). Since the mid-sixteenth century, a “veritable flood of anti-Machiavellian literature defended the relevance of Christian moral principles not only to utopian visions of domestic rule and foreign diplomacy, but also to practical and successful statesmanship”\(^{71}\) were produced. In addition, a “flood” of Baroque art by Jesuits and other religious patrons filled churches, palaces, and government buildings throughout the Catholic world. These extolled the virtuous life of the saints and rulers of the past and of contemporary rulers as Counter-Reformation remedies for Machiavelli’s ideas.

Many Catholic theologians argued that the best form of government was a monarch with an almost unlimited power to rule, so to stabilize the political and religious settlements made a reality by the Reformation. While ultimately responsible to God, the monarch’s power to a certain extent was based on the original consent of the people. Once the people had given the power, the monarch had this power irrevocably unless he demonstrated that he was a despot. One of the tools at the disposal of the monarch to increase his reputation, and therefore, enhanced his powers to rule was displayed virtue and nobility.\(^{72}\) Painting, sculpture, and building magnified the monarch’s image.

\(^{71}\) Irving Lavin, “Bernini’s Image of the Ideal Christian Monarch,” 446.

\(^{72}\) On the concept of reputation, see Robert Bireley, *The Counter Reformation Prince* (Raleigh, N. C., 1990). This concept is demonstrated well in his research and evidence.
Lavin’s contribution to the expansion of scholarship about anti-Machiavellianism and the art world of Catholic Europe should also be expanded to the mental world and the artistic realm of early modern England. As noted in earlier chapters, theories about governing--expressed in the words and deeds of James and Charles--were similar if not identical to the theory of government that the Catholic absolutists constituted during this same era. The expanded use of art for such a purpose by the Stuarts, from the beginning of their rule in England until the outbreak of the Civil War, is significant evidence of their mimicking the great Catholic powers in display. The design of the Banqueting House and the works Charles collected and commissioned certainly testify to this notion of political-religious art to enhance reputation.

The notion of the Catholic prince-hero and the hero’s qualities are important in understanding the political use of art by Charles I. The elements of the prince-hero were given by Giovanni Batista Pigna, who worked in the second half of the sixteenth century mainly for the court of the D’Este dukes of Ferrara. He was at court as a professor and secretary. As a priest-author and one of the prominent Italian anti-Machiavellians, Pigna was virtually possessed by the idea of the hero. He published two works in 1561, a treatise, *Il Principe*, dedicated to Duke Emmanuelle Filiberto of Savoy, but written for Alfonzo II of Ferrara, and an epic poem entitled *Gli heroici*, dedicated to Alfonso: and in 1570 a massive history of the d’Este princes.73

According to Lavin, Giovanni Battista Pigna best articulated this theory of prince-hero developed by Catholic anti-Machiavellians in a clear and deliberate manner around the last third of sixteenth century.74 It was a political theory ready to be fashioned in stone and paint.

73 Giovanni Battista Pigna’s, *Il Principe* was published in Venice in 1561 along with *Gli heroici* in the same year. *Historia de principi di Este* was published in Ferrara in 1570. The connection with Venice is extremely important. Venice was a major stopping point for the English visits during this period of the Grand Tour.

74 Irving Lavin, 450.
Pigna developed elaborate theories about the virtuous prince. He argued that the prince was superior to those he governed and had hosts of higher angels as guardians. This seems odd to us today but seemed reasonable in a culture defined by social order. The prince was closer to God as God’s chosen, therefore the prince received special graces. Pigna, who died in 1575, taught that the prince needed more divine guidance than ordinary men. Monarchs’ elevated status in the “great chain of being” meant that others depended on them and their good government. The prince thus had a “divine” nature. Each link in the great chain might be further divided into its component parts. In Renaissance society, the king was at the top, followed by the aristocratic lords, and then the peasants below them. Solidifying the king’s position at the top of humanity’s social order became standard for those who supported the divine right of kings theory. The king was like a father in a family—the father-head of the household; below him was his wife; below her, their children. The children subdivided so that the males were one link above the females.

To understand Pigna’s example of the prince, as the supreme human link in the great chain, is to understand his position in which the divine nature of the prince derived from his duty and purpose. His purpose was to reach perfection and thus enable his subjects to reach toward perfection through emulating the prince, who was God’s representative. Thus, the prince was given rule over others so that he could dedicate himself to eradicating evil and introducing virtue among the governed. The ideal prince was an example of heroic human nature that surpassed

75 This was echoed in the writings of Bernini in the Diary of the Paul Freart de Chantelou, *Cavaliere Bernini’s Visit to France*, ed. Anthony Blunt (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 235.
other mere mortals. Thus, the prince was “sacral in nature” which allowed him to adapt the religious justification for the active life as a witness to those he governed.\footnote{Giovanni Battista Pigna, \textit{Il principe di Nel quale si discriue come debba essere il principe heroico, sotto il cui gouerno vn felice popolo, possa tranquilla & beatamente viuere}, (Venice : appresso Francesco Sansouino, 1561). This divine nature of the good Catholic prince and his special role is argued throughout this work.}

As numerous Catholic theologians argued for this theory of divine right monarchy, it produced broad implications for European history and for the role of the papacy in particular during the early seventeenth century. If the king’s power derived directly from God, the pope did not serve as an intermediary between the celestial and the terrestrial realms. However, if the king’s power was only by consent of the people, then the pope could interfere as the Vicar of Christ on earth. The role taken by Pigna and other anti-Machiavellians was to “liberate” the Catholic prince from direct control of the papacy and to help bring about the realities of the Treaty of Westphalia (1649), which gave significant theological and political cover for “divine right monarchs.” It is clear that the opinions James and Charles espoused, regarding their political “independence” from the papacy, agreed with those of the anti-Machiavellians, as expressed in \textit{Basilikon Doron}.

This expression of the virtuous prince clearly was in the mind of Charles and other princes when they bought the greatest artwork for display and commissioned the greatest works in the Baroque age. Lavin has traced the important links between Bernini and this theory of a divine right Counter-Reformation prince. He applied Bireley’s thought about anti-Machiavellianism to this arguably greatest artist of the Baroque, Bernini. For Lavin, one of the most important sources for formation of this ideology and its expression in the art of the Counter-Reformation was the Jesuits, especially Domenico Gamberti. Gamberti was an important contemporary of
Bernini and a chronicler of the dukes of Medina. Gamberti used the writings of Pigna to elaborate on his theory of the heroic prince.\textsuperscript{77} Gamberti took Plato’s notion of \textit{idea} seriously in that he truly believed the prince was a divine model for all in his principality.\textsuperscript{78}

For Gamberti, the perfect prince was one who united all the requisite virtues in a harmonious chorus. Basing much of his thought on Thomas Aquinas, the most important source for the anti-Machiavellian thinkers of the Counter-Reformation, Gamberti “divides the competencies of the prince-hero into two spheres, the civil and the military, in both which the primary virtues are the four cardinal virtues, prudence, fortitude, justice and temperance.”\textsuperscript{79} No evidence indicates that Gamberti or Bernini ever met, but that is not beyond the realm of possibilities. They were well-traveled and important figures in their rival courts in Italy. However, ample evidence shows that they both drew their ideas from the same source, Tarquinio Galluzzi. This distinguished professor of rhetoric worked in the Jesuit College in Rome and the Collegio Romano for almost the entire first half of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{80}

Galluzzi was extremely important in the development of Jesuit drama and wrote several important tragedies on Christian subjects in the classical style. He also wrote theoretical treatises and commentaries. He also penned a lengthy commentary on Aristotle’s \textit{Nicomachean Ethics}, which was the primary source for the contemporary idea of the prince-hero. Here “Aristotle describes the earliest phase of monarchy, which was the age of heroes where there were gods

\textsuperscript{77} Irving Lavin, 451.

\textsuperscript{78} Irving Lavin, 452.

\textsuperscript{79} Irving Lavin, 452.

\textsuperscript{80} Irving Lavin, 452-455.
among men whom they ruled by common consent.”

Galluzzi was such an important figure in Rome that he preached the funeral for Robert Bellarmine (died 1621). Galluzzi undoubtedly knew Bernini, who designed the tomb for the cardinal and executed a famous portrait bust of Bellarmine in reverent devotion. It is clear that Bernini was exposed to this Catholic theology of prince-hero and that many of his works exemplified this notion. Prince and prelate alike inhaled Bernini’s works. Catholic absolutists actively sought Bernini’s works because they clearly expressed the idea of a virtuous monarch. These Catholic absolutes included ecclesiastical princes, the d’Este, and finally the most notable of the “ideal absolute monarchs” of the seventeenth century, Louis XIV. Charles Stuart also wanted Bernini’s works.

The history of the Bernini bust of Charles I (A-11 and A-12) is well known. Queen Henrietta Maria commissioned this work in 1635. Bernini modeled the statue on the Van Dyck triple-portrait of the king. Van Dyke began the triptych Charles I in Three Positions (A-102) in 1633. The Catholic Dutch master took pains to make it a superb piece of art, not merely recording the king’s head from three different vantage points, but making the triptych a unified composition to impress the Roman cognoscenti and painters. Van Dyck’s work, a treasure in itself, was a masterpiece of spontaneity “dashed off for this very purpose by the greatest

---
81 Irving Lavin 455.
82 Irving Lavin 455.
portraitist of the age.”

After the bust’s completion, Thomas Baker took charge of the bust to ensure safe arrival in London. Bernini also completed a splendid bust for Baker (A-104).

The king expressed to Bernini in a letter that he hoped the artist would sculpt a work in marble “above the best quality” showing his true character. Using proper channels, the queen officially commissioned the marble bust. Pope Urban VIII and his nephew, Cardinal Francesco Barberini, authorized the commission for Bernini. That the pope’s official artisan would take such an important commission from a “heretic” king certainly speaks of the growing “détente” during the 1630s. This is remarkable, considering the religious controversies of the Elizabethan Age and the difficulties James I had with the “Oath of Allegiance” controversies after the Gunpowder Plot, in 1605.

The bust was completed by late August of 1636, and its availability reported to the queen, though the work did not reach England until April 1637. The reason for the delay was its exhibition in Rome before the dispatch to England. The piece created a sensation as one of Bernini’s greatest portrait busts. According to many sources, including Cardinal Barberini, the agent of the Duke of Modena, it was “truly beautiful and you could not imagine the universal applause it has received, nor do I think that there exists a Cardinal, Ambassador or gentleman of

84 Charles Avery, Bernini Genius of the Baroque (London: Thames and Hudson, 1997), 225.
85 Oliver Millar, 63.
86 Oliver Millar, 63.
87 Oliver Millar, 63.
88 Charles Avery, 225.
89 Charles Avery, 225.
quality who has not desired to see it.” It was so remarkable a work some quipped that Charles “shall become a Catholic” when he saw it.⁹⁰ Of course, this was the intention all along. Charles clearly was the target of a campaign of conversion to Roman Catholicism, “and this flattering image might even have had an effect in this direction when it reached the King’s eye in distant London,”⁹¹ according to Cardinal Barberini.

Because of this commission’s importance for good relations with England, the cardinal himself supervised the dispatching of the bust to England.⁹² Due to the delicacy of the carved marble image and the danger of the crossing, great pains were taken in its packing and transport.⁹³ George Con, the papal legate who was returning to London, helped care for the sculpture. Con was to testify to its perfect form on leaving Rome, and he was in charge of its careful unpacking at its final destination.⁹⁴ According to eyewitnesses, as the planks were removed from the crate, the superintendent of statues exclaimed the bust was a miracle, given its beauty and likeness to the king.⁹⁵ The queen and king at Oatlands enthusiastically received it on 17 July 1637. This work was a resounding success, and those who viewed it were completely taken by the virtuosity of Bernini “not only for the exquisiteness of the worke but the likness and near resemblance it had to the king’s countenance.”⁹⁶

---

⁹⁰ Charles Avery, 225.
⁹¹ Charles Avery, 225.
⁹² Oliver Millar, 63.
⁹³ Charles Avery, 225.
⁹⁴ Charles Avery, 225.
⁹⁵ Charles Avery, 225.
⁹⁶ Oliver Millar, 63
For Charles, that “countenance” was the depiction of him as a virtuous and noble Christian prince. The bust was such a success that Bernini was paid with a diamond worth 4000 scudi, a large sum for such a work, even for a king. 97 Another version of the payment was given by Baldinucci, a biographer of Bernini. He related the dramatic tale that Charles was so pleased with the bust that he took the ring directly off his finger, and that it was worth 6000 scudi. This was a royal gesture not out of character for the connoisseur Charles. In either case, Vatican etiquette demanded that the reward for Bernini come from the Catholic queen. Therefore, Bernini rather slowly received payment from Henrietta Maria six months after the reception of the bust. 98 The figure of 6000 or 4000 scudi was an extravagant amount many times more than that paid for Bernini’s busts of Scipione Borghese. It was twice the value paid for the over lifesized statue of Urban VIII by the Senate of Rome, constructed at the same time as the bust for Charles. “Indeed, it was more than [the] already generous 3000 scudi that the sculptor was to receive in 1650 for his more elaborate bust of the Duke of Modena, and more than he was paid for the bust of Louis XIV.” 99

As reported to the Barberini’s, “the satisfaction of the King in respect of the Head passes all expression: no person of quality comes to court but is immediately taken by the King himself to see it in public.” 100 This report testifies to a rather more liberal viewing of the king’s artworks than some historians have allowed. Charles and Henrietta Maria were no doubt smitten by the work and understood its value as a work of art, but also as a propaganda piece extolling

97 Oliver Millar, 63.
98 Charles Avery, 226.
99 Charles Avery, 226.
100 Charles Avery, 226.
the virtue of the king. Charles was thankful that the greatest living sculptor/artist of the time and his patron Pope Urban VIII, the “Solomon of Rome,” allowed the luxury of this work.

While Bernini was working on the bust, he noted that there was something “of [the] funest and unhappy, which the countenance of that Excellent Prince forbode”\textsuperscript{101} in the portrait Van Dyck had made. Bernini’s expression about the ambiguity of Van Dyke’s work was almost prophetic, considering the highs and the lows that Charles would endure in the ten years after he received the bust. Remarkably, regarding the substantial destruction of Caroline works during the Civil War, the bust survived the turmoil and ravages of the Commonwealth but was tragically lost in the Whitehall fire of 1698. Fortunately, because of its fame, several copies and casts of this work were made in plaster and in stone. The only plaster cast that remains is of the face (A-12).\textsuperscript{102}

Nicholas Stone (1618-1647), the English cognoscenti and sculptor who worked under Bernini at Rome, left a sketchbook and a notebook describing his and his father’s works. He witnessed firsthand the reactions many had to the bust. Stone remarked on the exquisiteness of the work and on the excellent resemblance that it had to the king’s “countenance.”\textsuperscript{103} While in Rome in 1639, Stone impressed Bernini enough that Bernini created a bust for him even though Bernini was overextended due to the great demand placed on his talents. This occurrence is remarkable since the pope had ordered Bernini to stop making works without the pope’s direct

\textsuperscript{101} John Evelyn, *Numismata, a discourse of medals, ancient and modern together with some account of heads and effigies of illustrious, and famous persons in sculps, and taille-douce, of whom we have no medals extant, and of the use to be derived from them : to which is added a digression concerning physiognomy* (London: Printed for Benj. Tooke, 1697), 335.


\textsuperscript{103} Gudron Raatschen, 813.
permission. However, Bernini yielded to this charming young Englishman and made an exquisite bust for him. In his diary, Stone described the questions Bernini had about the bust of Charles.

Bernini said:

Come to St. Peeters and I should haue what I desyred, being in uery good umor hee askt me whether I had seene the head of marble wch was sent into England for the King, and to tell him the truth what was spoken of itt. I told him that whosouer I had heard admired itt nott only for the exquistenesse of the work but the likenesse and nere resemblance itt had to the Kings countenance. He sayd that diuers had told him so much but he could not beliue itt, then he began to uery free in his discourse to aske if nothing was broke of itt in carryge and how itt was preserued not from danger. I told him that when as I saw itt that all was hole and safe, the wch (saythe) I wonder att, but I tooke (sayth he) as much care of packing as studye in makin of itt; also I told him that now itt was perserued with a case of silke, he deyred to know in what manner.  

Bernini, too, was pleased by the bust’s positive reception, and it certainly added to his reputation in northern Europe.

It is clear that this tragically lost masterpiece followed the same tradition as many other works by Bernini dating from the 1630s. Such artists as Algardi in Rome, Francois Dieussart, Le Sueur and the Stones in England often emulated these works. The busts of Charles (A-11, A-12) created after Bernini’s bust followed his standard type and portrayal. The sitter’s attention seems to have been caught by some distant vision, toward which he turns in a pervasive and spontaneous movement.

Of special concern is the treatment of the drapery, which envelops the body and creates an uncanny illusion or rather series of illusions. No cut edges, only folds are visible along the lower silhouette, from the right shoulder down across the chest, the drapery is pulled tight and knotted at the lower left, thus the body does not seem to be cut off but rather wrapped, Christo-like, as a self-sufficient object.”

Though this is a description of Bernini’s Bust Francesco I d’Este, (A-105), it describes most of

---


the busts Bernini created in this period concerning their overwhelming mass and grandeur.\textsuperscript{106} This is precisely what the artist was seeking to convey and what the patrons sought. It also is a description of Charles’s bust.

One feature draped across some torsos was a cloth that Lavin associated with a \textit{parapetasma}, a cloth of honor. This suggested the heavenly sublimation of the deceased.\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Parapetasmas} were seen often in Roman sarcophagi and used by Bernini in cenotaphs, such as the cenotaph dedicated to Maria Raggi in \textit{Santa Maria Sopra Minerva} in Rome (Figure 7-2). For the dead, this cloth is open; for the living (such as the bust of the living Charles I) (Figure 2-13), the \textit{parapetasma} is bound up as a large voluminous sash and gathered at the shoulder. However, it still encompasses the entire torso and is not cut, as is the armor or other cloth on the bust. The heads of most of these busts are relatively small, allowing the work to show the ample, tightly curled tresses of hair and to give the large torso a “larger than life” impression.

An important aspect of these Baroque works is the context in which the hero-prince is a response to the dilemma posed by two “fundamental yet seemingly incompatible political tenets of anti-Machiavellian Catholicism: the spiritual power of the absolute monarch derived ultimately from God, but his effective power derived ultimately from the consent of his subjects.”\textsuperscript{108} For Lavin, the key to understanding this paradox in artwork that portrays the Baroque monarch is to understand that the practice of virtue or virtuosity needed to be transformed into a politicized equivalent of Christian virtue “especially the cardinal virtues of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{106} Irving Lavin, 446.
\item \textsuperscript{107} Irving Lavin, 448.
\item \textsuperscript{108} Irving Lavin, 450.
\end{itemize}
prudence, fortitude, justice and temperance.”\textsuperscript{109} Lavin wrote, “Magnificence was thus an element of fundamental importance to the Renaissance and Baroque court as a Christian virtue. This exultation was a prodigal expenditure, as virtue came through a humanist revival of a Thomism-Aristotelian philosophical position.”\textsuperscript{110} These works for the Stuart dynasty by Bernini, Van Dyke, and Rubens are best understood in the context of a Baroque, Counter-Reformation, and anti-Machiavellian art tradition. This tradition was formed in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and transferred by contact and design to England through the Stuart monarchy and their flirtation with Catholic ideas and forms.

\textbf{Van Dyck: the Image of the King}

“A new age began with the accession of Charles I, the princely patron who bought the great Mantua Collection, and whose visit to Spain in 1624, where he saw the royal portraits by Titian, Rubens and Velázquez, led to his search for a comparable painter for the English Court.”\textsuperscript{111} That search ended with the arrival of Van Dyck. Of all the artists who were encouraged to come from the continent to work at the Stuart court, Van Dyck was a superb cognoscente of the style and the iconography that by Charles and Henrietta Maria desired. As the star pupil of Rubens and as a master in his own right, he painted for his royal patrons far more sophisticated and straightforward portraits than any produced before in England. Charles saw these themes in the great tradition of painters and collectors in the arrangement of the galleries he

\textsuperscript{109} Irving Lavin, 450.


visited in Spain and France. These galleries emphasized the importance of the royals and placed them in the great tradition of divine right rulers.

The seeds of an idealization of Charles as the “perfect” absolute began to grow when Van Dyck first came to London in the second decade of the 1600s. Though he departed from England in early 1621, many in court, including the Arundels and the king, followed his career. He was actively courted to return to England. Charles warmly welcomed him back when Van Dyck returned in the spring of 1632. Charles immediately knighted him and gave him an annual pension and a house near Blackfriars. More than any other painter, Van Dyck created a revolution in English painting. His training enabled him to design on a large scale, and use beautiful technique and delicacy. He captured the essence of his subjects and magnified their personalities, which was especially true in his work for the royal family--and Charles in particular.

He made Charles a figure of religious awe, power, and kingship expressing the king’s “majesty” more impressively than any other artist did, with perhaps the exceptions of Rubens or Bernini. All the equestrian works such, as King Charles I on Horseback (A-106) and King Charles I on Horseback with M. D. St. Antoine (A-107) show the absolutist ideal of anti-Machiavellianism. They also reflect a religious quality expressed in such works of a divinely chosen monarch in traditions already well established in Spain, France, and Italy.

In particular, the likeness of the king on horseback (A-106) takes as its point of departure the archetypal image on the face of all the Great Seals of England. It shows the monarch as warrior. King Charles is wearing Greenwich-made armor and holding a commander’s baton. A

page carries his helmet. In keeping with the imperial claim of the inscription: CAROLUS REX MAGNAE BRITANIAE—Charles King of Great Britain—the pose and forest setting repeats Titian’s equestrian representation of Emperor Charles V at Mühlberg. Both works recalled the well-known Roman bronze of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (thought to be Constantine) on horseback. Over his armor, Charles wears a gold ornament bearing the image of Saint George and the Dragon, the so-called Lesser George. He wore it constantly, because contained a portrait of Henrietta Maria. It was with him the day he died. Here, however, it identifies him with the Order of the Garter of which Saint George was patron. As Garter Sovereign, he is riding, like Charles V his namesake, as the chief of his gallant knights in defense of faith and virtue.

In a philosophical sense, the portrait is a visual assertion of Charles’s claim to divine kingship. Charles is high above our heads on the horizon line, ensuring that our viewpoint is roughly at the level of his stirrup. However, Charles’s face is not distorted by foreshortening. Instead, Van Dyck’s three-quarter view refines his features, and he bestrides his horse with a distant air of dignified reflection. This is exactly as Titian had portrayed the emperor almost seventy-five years earlier.

As a believer in the divine right of kings, Charles wished to translate this thought into paint and stone for all to see. According to E. F. Halliday, Van Dyck was, along with Rubens, ideally suited to the task of court painter: A disciple of Titian, by the elegance of his style, idealization rather than flattery, he was able to portray his royal and aristocratic subjects as they would like to appear and be remembered . . . for his portraits have forever fixed the image of Charles, his family, and the supporters of his claim to absolutism.”

Halliday also noted that:

Van Dyck’s portraits of the king celebrate him, often on a scale unprecedented in this country [England], as the country gentleman, as a devoted family man, living in blissful

---

and fruitful union with his [Catholic] Queen, and as a famous horseman who could play the role of the warrior and hero in an imperial theme; a theme made up of classical, Venetian and Rubensian elements.”

A spiritual quality is evoked by Van Dyck’s works. In his paintings of Charles, Charles seems almost Christ-like. The king’s features were extremely like the popular iconology resembling those of Christ in this period. Clearly, in the minds of absolutists, the king did “stand in” for Christ. These works were the “visual counterpart of the Cavalier poetry of the decade, of Thomas Carew and Suckling, daring and graceful, immensely accomplished, but rarely passionate and profound.” Perhaps this was true for the poetry, but not of the Van Dyck paintings. These paintings were indeed profound in that they portrayed a greater image than the king gave in person. Van Dyck understood what his master wanted and gave it to him.

Van Dyck also painted religious works for Charles and Henrietta Maria. In particular, the painting of the *Holy Family with Partridges* (A-108) is noteworthy. “The unusual iconography of this religious painting can be understood only in relation to the Neoplatonic climate at the court of Charles I, particularly to the poetry and masques, and to the royal patron for whom it was made.”

Looking at the iconography of *Holy Family with Partridges*, it is possible to see a costume made for the queen. Henrietta Maria was, we will remember, both a Catholic queen and a queen of love at a Neo-Platonic court. As a Catholic, she would have

---

114 Oliver Millar, 53.

115 This notion of Charles’s similarity to the features of the common portrait of Christ was noted by Roy Strong in his *Van Dyck: Charles I on Horseback* (New York, 1972), Chapter 4, and Kevin Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, 224-227.

116 F. E. Halliday, 152.

appreciated Van Dyck’s picture for the number of Counter-Reformatory references to the Virgin and, to a lesser extent, to the church. 118

Roland pointed out traditional and easily identifiable iconography, such as the open pomegranate referring to the church’s many parts. Closed pomegranates also related to the Virgin’s chastity. Other fruits and flowers, such as roses, apples, and chestnuts, were also symbols of the Virgin and purity. 119 This painting is full of Counter-Reformation and royal iconography.

Some of these symbols were borrowed directly from Rubens. The standard reference to the Virgin, the parrot, which appears in Rubens’s *Holy Family with Parrot* of 1625, is one such example. Rubens also painted a *Holy Family under an Apple tree* on the wings of the Ildefonso Altarpiece that Van Dyck saw before his departure to England. 120 Van Dyck repeated the iconography used by his master, Rubens. This iconography helps to identify the extremely Counter-Reformation flavor of this artwork. Combined in a pastoral landscape with a parrot in an apple tree, an emphasis is on the Virgin as the New Eve. 121 Mary, Joseph, and Jesus rest in a heavenly and idyllic landscape as angels perform for an appreciative Christ child, and redemption is assured. This is the “landscape” Charles and his queen proclaimed as their own in their masques and their rituals at court.

118 Margaret Roland, 127.

119 Margaret Roland, 127.

120 This work is at the Museum of Fine Arts, Antwerp.

121 See Margaret Roland for the following details of iconography in footnotes on page 132. St. Ambrose noted, “Eve caused us to be damned with an apple, Mary redeemed us with the gift from a tree.” E. Panofsky wrote on page 30 of *Problems in Titian, Mostly Iconographic* (New York: New York University Press, 1969) that the symbol of the apple and the parrot (on pp. 28-29) are connected with the Virgin in Titian’s works. Roland suggested the association of the parrot with Van Dyck’s work can be found in J. D. Stewart’s “Hidden Persuaders: Religious Symbolism in van Dyck’s Portraiture,” in *Essays on Van Dyck*, (Ottawa: National Gallery of Canada, 1983), p. 66.
The dancing putti have an important connection with the masques of the Caroline period. It is important to note that Henrietta Maria and Charles not only took delight in the dances but also participated in them. An integral part was dancing children. Dancing cupids were associated with Ben Jonson’s *Love’s Triumph through Callipolis*, in which fifteen cupids danced for the pleasure of the court.\(^{122}\) In addition, in James Shirley’s *Triumph of Peace* of 1634, which Van Dyck likely saw, naked children with silver wings sat in a stage set compartment acting as putti watching the affair. In Van Dyck’s work, *Holy Family with Partridges*, putti dance before Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, as they did before Charles and Henrietta Maria in their celebrations of an idyllic and “holy” court.

The most important symbol chosen by Van Dyck, in a Christian context, is the sunflower. It is an unusual association with the Holy Family. As a Christian symbol, it refers to Mary’s love of Christ.\(^{123}\) It is also connected to classical antiquity as a flower that perpetually turns to Apollo, god of light.\(^{124}\) The sunflower seeks light and is emblematic of the soul turning to Christ, the true light. In this work, one sunflower blooms and turns to the source of light. However, another bloom turns toward the Christ child and breaks the laws of nature. This movement toward Christ is a statement of Christianity’s superiority to the classical and natural. Van Dyck intended the Virgin to be analogous to Henrietta Maria as the sunflower turns to the Virgin and child, thus assuming a monarchical meaning. Some slight resemblance is made to the queen, but she is “fuller” and more “Rubenesque” in this work than in real life.


\(^{123}\) Margaret Roland, 129. The sunflower is also connected to classical antiquity as a flower that perpetually turns to Apollo.

\(^{124}\) Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Book IV.
This connection to Henrietta Maria is made evident in one of Van Dyck’s other works, *Self Portrait With a Sunflower* (A-109), in which Van Dyck shows the gold collar and medal that King Charles I gave him in 1633 to celebrate his knighthood. The sunflower represents the king and royal patronage. In this painting Charles is the reflection of divine light, thus the flower turns toward the portraits of the king and queen contained in the locket in Van Dyck’s regalia. The use of the sunflower is clear as a vehicle to show “divine” radiance in both of these works.

Some evidence suggests that the *Holy Family with Partridges* (A-108) was made to respond to attacks on the queen. Henrietta Maria, because of her militant Catholicism, was often criticized by Puritan opponents of the regime, such as William Prynne. Prynne was brought to the High Commission Court for publishing *Histriomastix or the Player’s Scourge* after the queen’s theatrical performance. This tract described women actors as “notorious whores” and was clearly directed at the queen. Henrietta Maria’s portrayal of the Virgin Mary emphasized the queen’s attributes as a chaste and responsible ideal. Van Dyck’s association of Henrietta Maria with the Virgin certainly rebutted the concept of her as a whore.

In Davenant’s masque of 1634, Temple of Love, we can find a parallel in which the queen performed as the Queen of Narsinga whose task is to re-establish the Temple of Chaste Love. It appears that Van Dyck’s intentions in his *Holy Family* may well have been the same. The representation of the Virgin in a pastoral setting, and being entertained by dancing putti, implies the queen’s role in court performances was as acceptable as Mary’s amusement and

---


126 J. Maidment and W. H. Logan, editors of *The Dramatic Works of Sir William D’Avenant*, vol. I (Edinburgh and London, 1872) noted on page 824 that Prynne’s *Histriomastix or the Player’s Scourge* was published the day after the queen’s pastoral *The Shepherd’s Paradise* was performed at Somerset House.
acquiescence in the painting. It also connects Henrietta Maria with a powerful Christian, as well as Counter-Reformation symbol, her namesake, Mary, Ever Virgin.

The sources for Van Dyck’s Catholic iconography were several. Clearly, as Rubens’s greatest pupil he learned most from his master. Any Catholic clergyman, many were at court by the time of his arrival, could have advised him, even his brother Theodore, canon of the Church of St. Michael, Antwerp, who was invited to court as chaplain in 1633 by Queen Henrietta Maria. It is doubtful whether Theodore served as a chaplain, but he did visit London and his brother for almost a year in 1633 and 1634.127 Van Dyck was a deeply pious man from an extremely dedicated family; one of his sisters was a nun. He was steeped in Counter-Reformation vocabulary from infancy.

**Spanish Model: The Rebuilding of Whitehall Palace**

One of the most important projects Charles planned before the Civil War was the complete renovation of Whitehall Palace. Though this was unrealized, it is important in understanding the mindset of Charles, his plans for display, and the religious and political motivations in this doomed project. Margaret Whinney documented the existence of plans for the renovation of Whitehall by John Webb no later than the mid-1630s.128 Notions of a renewed Whitehall were earlier. These plans were in connection with the construction of the new Banqueting House at Whitehall. The model for the project was the Escorial (A-13). As discussed in Chapter 2, it is important to remember that Philip II and his architect Herrera envisioned this project as a direct re-creation of the Temple of Solomon (A-111). The Escorial’s iconography

127 Margaret Roland, 131.

and design were steeped in Christian lore and heavily influenced by Christian Hermeticism and Neo-Platonism. These notions were found in the works of many of the Jesuit architects during this period. Geometrical designs of facilities with quadratic inner courtyards and risalits are also found in El Escorial. Villalpando, a disciple of Juan de Herrera, published a work that explained the importance of the Escorial and other such building programs.

Villalpando published *De Postrema Ezechielis Propheetae Visione* in 1605. His major work was based on the vision of the prophet Ezekiel. It inspired many European illustrators and was circulated among the master builders of the 17th century. His reconstructed drawings were based on the assumption that the buildings of Jerusalem were designed using the laws of geometry. The drawings were drawn in parallel or orthographic projection. Villalpando likened the Temple of Solomon to God’s plan and vision for architecture. This divine, this religious plan, was classical in nature. He proposed an original link between the classical orders and Solomon’s Temple. After the republication of Vitruvius’s *De Architectura*, which had reported that the origins of the orders lay in the architecture of ancient Greece, Villalpando reinterpreted the orders to have a higher authority, coming instead from Solomon.

Villalpando’s works proclaimed that the classical orders were derived from the architecture of Solomon’s Temple. Thus, he attempted to reconcile the Bible with the antique structural design described in Vitruvius’s text. Classical architecture’s origins then were in God’s


plans for holy construction. He suggested that the Greeks copied their ideas from Solomon; the connection with Solomon and Philip II is well documented. He cultivated the title of “King of Jerusalem” and foreshadowed James in seeking identity with Solomon. Spain’s Solomon, along with those who completed his works, was influential in reviving the notion of a priest-king. It appears that Charles was planning the same kind of connection for himself in London with a transformed and spectacular Whitehall complex with a Basilica Church at its center.

Charles’s firsthand experience of the monastery complex is undeniable. On his visit to win the hand of the Infanta, he visited and indeed stayed in the Escorial. He also owned his own copy of De Postrema Ezechielis Prophetae Vision by Villalpando. Even when he was imprisoned during the Civil War at Carisbrook Castle, he spent time studying this text. He continued to plan the reconstruction of Whitehall in case of a Royalist victory. Sir Thomas Herbert documents the importance of De Postrema for Charles in this firsthand account.

Nevertheless both times he carefully observed his usual Times set apart for his Devotion and for Writing. Mr. Harrington and Mr. Herbert continued waiting on his Majesty in the Bedchamber: he gave Mr. Herbert the charge of his Books, of which the King had a Catalogue, and from time to time had brought unto him, such as he was pleased to call for. The sacred Scripture was the Book he most delighted in, read often in Bp. Andrews Sermons, Hooker’s Ecclesiastical Policy, Dr. Hammond’s Works, Villalpandus upon Ezekiel, & Sands’s Paraphrase upon King David’s Psalms.

This may seem an extravagance or lack of understanding of his dire situation. Nevertheless, Charles continued to dream of his victory and the reestablishment of royal supremacy.


Roy Strong drew attention to the similarities between Villapando’s elevation of the Temple of Solomon and the Escorial (A-111) as an imitator of this imperial-religious temple, as well as and to John Webb’s early drawing for the re-building at Whitehall Palace (Figure 7-18). The master of the king’s works, Inigo Jones, also believed that

> the recovery of classical architecture with its mirror image of a harmonic universe was for him [Inigo] also the recovery of a Christian architecture, the classical orders sanctified by their use in the Temple of Solomon and by Vitruvius, who wrote in the reign of Augustus when Christ was born.”

Both Wittkower and Strong hinted at the importance of the Catholic sources from imperial Spain, as well as one of its major proponents of classical architecture and absolutism proclaimed in Villalpando’s work. However, they did not emphasize the importance of this source for much of English classicism. Nor did they see a more concerted effort by the Stuart regime to synthesize a clearer artistic policy using the classical ideal as the backbone of Stuart artistic policy. The Stuarts would have accepted the Catholic notion growing since the early Renaissance about a clear connection with antiquity. They also would have accepted the sanctity of the classical as a Catholic religious expression and would have made it their own.

A copy of Villalpando’s commentary belonged to the Royal Library and bears James I’s arms on the bindings. It also appears that James looked to Villalpando for some of his ideas about London’s movement toward a classical plan and ideal. Bishop Williams, in his *Great Britains Salomon*, noted Villapando’s influence in the funeral of James. Williams emphasized

---

134 Strong, 64. Rudolf Wittkower first posits this in his “Inigo Jones ‘Puritanissimo Fiero,’” *Burlington Magazine* 90 (1948).


136 John Williams, *Great Britains Salomon A sermon preached at the magnificent funerall, of the most high and mighty king, James, the late King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. At the Collegiat Church of Saint Peter at Westminster, the*
the Solomonic connection and remarked “Salomon beautified very much his Capitall Citie with Buildings, and Water-workes . . . [as] did King James . . . the most constant Patron, of Churches.”

This sermon echoed the words of Villalpando about Philip II, who was also enthralled by classical ideas.

Webb’s usage of Villalpando in his proposed plans for Whitehall solidified the connection to Spanish royal building programs. Webb’s earlier drawing for the proposed Whitehall “Escorial” (A-112, left) shows a square plan with courtyards with a central church. This is almost identical with Villalpando’s temple illustrations. Vaughn Hart noted that Webb knew of the plans illustrated in Villalpando I (A-112, right).

Thus, the similarity to the designs for London’s Temple/Palace is surely no coincidence.

**Conclusion**

Catholic influence was more pervasive in early modern England than has been recognized. This pervasiveness can be seen in the attempts of bishops to model their churches not on continuing reformation tastes, but a return to the common ancestry of early Christianity, as exampled by the Laudian movement. The bishops also looked to contemporary practices of Catholicism and used the literature of post-Tridentine Catholicism for inspiration.

The artistic evidence given in this chapter suggests that Charles was much more cognizant in his display of art than earlier historians have argued. His models were Rome and Paris, but most of all Madrid for the display of absolutist artwork. London and other important areas of

---

137 John Williams, 39, 42.

138 Vaughn Hart, 112.
England were targeted to receive artwork to show the majesty and religious influence of the monarchy. These displays began to be better organized in the 1630s, but cut short by conflict in Scotland and the Civil War. Chapter 8 will deal with the treatment of Stuart artwork, which suggests that the opponents of the régime understood what the monarchy was attempting to communicate--and they reacted vigorously to what they perceived.
Figure 7-1. Le Sueur, *Charles I on Horse Back*. Photo by author.

Figure 7-2. Bernini. *Cenotaph of suor Maria Raggi*, Santa Maria Sopra Minerva, Rome. Photo by author.
Figure 7-3. The *Temple of Antoninus and Faustina* is an ancient Roman temple in the Roman Forum. The remains of the temple were converted into a church, San Lorenzo in Miranda, in the 7th or 8th century, for which it owes its splendid conservation. The baroque pediment, seen behind the colonnade, is from the early 17th century. The ten monolithic Corinthian columns of its pronaos are 17 m. tall. Photo by author.
CHAPTER 8
EPILOGUE AND CONCLUSION

Reaction to Stuart Building and Sculptural Programs

The statues at St. Paul’s Cathedral, by command of the Council of State, were thrown down and broken, dashed to pieces alongside the marble inscription that proclaimed Charles “father” of the church. The over life-sized statue of King Charles that once stood at the Royal exchange was symbolically beheaded, its scepter removed. In their place, a new inscription warned viewers that this was the fate of a tyrant.1 In addition to wide-spread iconoclasm, the new Commonwealth ordered Charles’s estates and his collections of art to be sold and dispersed. Parliamentary forces destroyed anything that “smelled” of popery.

Jones’s classical ornamentation at St. Paul’s became a focus of symbolic destruction. The Cathedral, an expression of royal Absolutism and Counter-Reformation architecture, was a key target for iconoclasts, while more generally, Catholic architecture was routinely attacked or benignly abandoned.2 Noted Royalists, Elias Ashmole and William Dugdale, appealed against Puritan iconoclasm. Dugdale noted: “Elias Ashmole, armiger, desires that this great choir, sanctified and holy, should remain as an icon so that the testimony of History should not be concerned that the holy temple of God, this majestic sanctuary of the building of St. Paul, should be destroyed by the passing of the ages or have been damaged by the religious neglect of future times.”3 Their fears were justified.

---


2 G. Addleshaw and F. Etchelles, 118. These authors noted that the irreverent and careless behavior toward the altar was encouraged by Puritans who attributed them to popery.

3 This quotation is taken from a shield in a plate illustrating the choir in Dugdale’s History and is attributed to Elias Ashmole.
Dugdale reported that Puritans had disfigured the Corinthian columns and tore at the royal statues.\(^4\) By the middle of the Civil War, the new religious ornamentation displayed there made the building fit, in the thought of Puritans, for quartering horses, a symbolic gesture to remind Londoners that Protestants had made St. Peter’s into a stable during the sack of Rome in 1527. St. Paul’s was no longer a sacred space. Dugdale noted that by 1649 a wall was made to separate the choir from the nave so Puritans could use the choir as a preaching place.\(^5\) Until the Restoration, the nave was used for purely secular purposes. St. Paul’s had become superfluous to Puritan and Calvinist sensibilities. Its rich architectural setting, its choir screen, and its procession-enhanced space were antithetical to the Puritan service based on Word. Even before the Civil War, a rowdy crowd, according to the Venetian Ambassador in England, “broke down the altar, and tore to pieces the books containing the new canons. They then tried to kill the very ministers of the archbishop.”\(^6\)

The Long Parliament and its supporters attacked crosses and crucifixes, which had grown familiar since 1619 before exploding in number throughout the Personal Rule. A prime example was the ancient monument at Cheapside, the topic of a small library of pamphlets and broadsheets in the early 1640’s, all aimed at its demise. The monument was fanatically destroyed in an act of public iconoclasm. In January of 1642, private iconoclasts broke through the iron gate, which had enclosed the monument since 1603, destroying several statues, including a figure of Christ. The end to the monument came on 2 May 1643, destroyed by a force of mounted soldiers and marching footmen, drums beating and trumpets sounding. A huge crowd


\(^{5}\) William Dugdale, 173.

\(^{6}\) G. Addleshaw and F. Etchells, 118.
cheered as Cheapside Cross smashed to the ground. Wenceslaus Hollar commemorated the
 dramatic occasion by noting that the demise of the cross came on the anniversary of the Holy
 Cross, a celebration recognized on the Catholic calendar. This was no coincidence. As in the
 1530s, 40s and 50s, iconoclasm was a response to the idolatry of Rome, and now to the
 paraphernalia used by Charles and the anti-Calvinists against the English Church.

Ironically, given that their view was that God was no respecter of places, parliamentary
 iconoclasts dedicated the site of the demolished cross for further ceremonies of the same sort.
 Hollar noted the burning of the books “in the place where the Corsse stodde” beneath his etching
 of its destruction. Iconoclasts, during days of thanksgiving in 1644 and 1645, burned popish
 books, the Book of Common Prayer, paintings, and Crucifixes in ceremonial bonfires where the
 Cross once stood. The Jacobean and Caroline movement that sought to bridge the religious
 divide through common forms of worship was violently rejected.

Extremist purifiers and militant iconoclasts, like those who managed a century earlier to
 annihilate much of England’s artistic heritage, halted the splendor of the Stuart court. It also
 stopped a Counter-Reformation movement that only re-emerged as “English Catholicism” during
 the 1800’s. A Puritan voice and Calvinist tastes were re-imposed. People were again to look to
 the Bible, to live by the Word. Image would have no place; God was to be heard, not seen. Some
 felt cleansed and thankful. “I am glad for my part, they are scoured of their gay gazing, and I
 marveled a great while since, how, and why the Organs grew so many and blew so loud, when


8 John Vicars, *A sight of ye trans-actions of these latter yeares emblemized with ingraven plats, which men may read without spectacles* (London: Sould, by Thomas Ienner, in his shop at the old Exhange, 1646), 21.
the very Homilies accused them for defiling God’s house.”

Others waited quietly. Some, like Matthew Wren, suffered in prison; others went into exile with the Royal family.

Immediately after the death of Charles, royal supporters evoked his memory through the words and images of the dead king; they challenged the propaganda of the Commonwealth. *Eikon Basilike, The Pourtrature of His Sacred Majestie in His Solitudes and Sufferings*, was a spiritual autobiography attributed to Charles I. Published on 9 February 1649, ten days after Charles’s execution this work answered the accusations of the Parliamentarians and clarified royal views. *Eikon Basilike*, in a simple, straightforward style, combined irenic styled prayers, urging forgiveness of Charles’s executioners. It also contained justifications for royal prerogative, “Anglicanism,” and the King’s political and military program.

It is not certain that Charles wrote the book. However, it was based on his private papers. John Gauden, bishop of Worcester claimed authorship. Jeremy Taylor may have had a hand in its revision. No matter the author, *Eikon Basilike* was a great success. Employing an effective and sympathetic prose style, it was deeply solemn, yet simple in expressing anti-Calvinist piety. Charles’s image was that of a steadfast king who admitted his weaknesses. It portrayed a man of deep faith that trusted in God despite adversity and calamities. *Eikon Basilike* proclaimed Charles’s chief weakness was in yielding to Parliament’s execution of the Earl of Strafford. Charles paid for this “sin” with his throne and his life. Reminiscent of the artists who portrayed


10 Irenism (from Greek *eirene* - peace) was an ideology conceived by Dutch theologian Erasmus (1469-1538) after the consequences of the Reformation became apparent. It postulated removing conflicts between different Christian creeds by way of mediation and gradual amalgamation of theological differences. Much in *Eikon Basilike* certainly agreed with contemporary Catholic theology.
Charles Stuart as Christ-like, it was a brilliant stroke of propaganda for the royalist cause. In 1649 alone, it went into thirty-five London editions. This book was so successful that Parliament commissioned John Milton to write a counter attack. Milton’s historical “corrective.” Eikonoklastes (The Icon-Breaker) was published in 1649. Interestingly, even the rebuttal of the royalist position spoke of “smashing” image. Milton’s response portrayed Charles and the Absolute monarchy as twin idols, concluding that Charles was justly overthrown to preserve the law of God and English state. But Milton’s theological counterattack failed to change many minds. After the Protectorate in 1660, many clamored for the return of Charles II.

**Iconoclasm and the Great Sale**

By disbanding the royal estates--placing monetary value on the king’s art collection--the Commonwealth symbolically demolished the monarchy. The power of the symbolism cannot be overstated. The objects that once defined the magnificence of Charles Stuart were de-valued, sold, and bought by anyone with money. The “enemies” of England gained as much as anyone. The artworks, sold to Catholic monarchies across the channel, represented a form of cultural vandalism. As Christopher Wren lamented in his Parentalia, the king’s execution and the virtual death of his art collection launched a period of “darkness and obscurity.”

11 Joad Raymond, of the University of East Anglia, noted that Eikon Basilike (“The image of the king”) was published within a few days of the execution of Charles I on 30 January 1649. It immediately became one of the great publishing successes of the seventeenth century, with thirty-five London editions in 1649.

12 John Milton, Eikonoklastes in answer to a book intitl’d Eikon basilike, the portrature of his Sacred Majesty in his solitudes and sufferings. The author I.M. Published by authority (London: Printed by Matthew Simmons, next dore to the gilded Lyon in Aldersgate street, 1649).

13 This quotation is taken from Per Palme’s, Triumph of Peace: A study of Whitehall Banqueting House (London, 1957), 83.
Anything that smacked of Catholicism--a French Queen, Arminianism or anti-Calvinism--was tagged for destruction or dispersal. The Parliament in August of 1643 called for the utter dissolution of all Monuments of Superstition or Idolatry. This included the destruction of a Rubens *Triumph of the Cross* in the Chapel at Somerset House along with the magnificent altar.¹⁴ The diplomatic community of London watched the Civil War with shock. The ambassador from Venice noted, “The commons are unrelenting toward the memory of the late king. Thus they have recently ordered all his jewels and valuables to be sold, to use the money for the fleet.”¹⁵ The executions of Charles and his Archbishop sent tremors through the royal Houses of Europe. The executions and their aftermath were viewed as an attack on Absolutism, organized religion, and monarchy. The foreign aristocracy remembered Charles in works such as *Allegory of Charles I of England and Henrietta Maria* (A-117). This vanitas painting reminds the viewer of the transience of life and power. Rich with symbolism, this allegory shows a terrestrial globe representing the importance of Charles I as a world leader. The atlas and glasses refer to the vanity of man’s intellectual pursuits, the skull, with the jaw brutally wrenched away, recalls Charles’s beheading; the laurel wreath, symbolizing glory, signals Charles’s hope for immortality. This work immortalized Charles I and Henrietta Maria, both as God’s faithful chosen, even in death.

Some in England had sympathy for the dead king and saw the country as bitterly divided. In the *Execution of Charles I* (A-118), the soul of Charles is observed going to heaven as the crowd recoils in horror at regicide. Several towns across England pronounced Charles II king,¹⁴ This routine iconoclasm is recorded in *Burning of crucifixes and ‘papistical’ books in England in 1643* (A-115). A strike at the traditional heart of the English Church, Canterbury Cathedral, was recorded in Thomas Johnson’s *Iconoclasts in Canterbury Cathedral* 9A-116).

¹⁵ Calendar of State Papers, Venice, 1647-1652, 92.
while London’s mayor refused to proclaim the abolition of the monarchy. The response of the
Rump Parliament, which ceased to resemble a parliament, purged anyone with conservative taste
or who showed sympathies to Charles II. Cromwell eventually dissolved the bothersome body.
In the end, the Parliamentary revolution for “democracy” and “true religion” became the very
thing it fought against, absolute.

Like the monarchy, the Church of England paid a price for fliting with Catholic art. The
Parliamentary Ordinance for Removing Superstitious Images, Crucifixes, Altars of Stone etc. out
of Churches in August 1643 demonstrates the radical direction of the Puritan program:

> How well pleasing it is to God, and conducible to the blessed reformation in his worship,
> all Altars and Tables of stone shall, before the 1st day of November be utterly taken away
> and demolished…and also all Communion-Tables removed from the east end of every
> such church…that all rails be likewise taken away… and the chancel ground of every
> such church or chapel or place of public prayer, which hath been, within 20 years past,
> raised for any Altar or Communion-Table to stand upon, shall, be before the said day, be
> laid down and leveled as the same as was before the said 20 years past. All tapers
> candlesticks and basins to be removed from Communion-Tables…all Crucifixes,
> Crosses, and all images and pictures of any one or more person of the Trinity, or the
> Virgin Mary and all other images and pictures of saints or superstitious inscriptions
> in…places of public prayer be taken away and defaced.¹⁶

This twenty-year limit included anything produced during the last years of James’s reign.

Parliament wanted to turn the clock back to a time before 1620. They tried to dismantle anything
associated with Catholicism, anti-Calvinism, Arminianism, and Laudianism.

Those connected with the thought of Lancelot Andrewes, or the other anti-Calvinists, were
denied as aberrations. Andrewes was the hero of “Catholic” Anglicanism. He was the liturgical
enthusiast who helped usher in the English Counter Reformation beliefs of “the use of copes and
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¹⁶ William Cobbett, *The Parliamentary history of England from the earliest period to the
year 1803, from which last-mentioned epoch it is continued downwards in the work entitled
wafer-bread, the washing of the priest’s hands before he prepared the elements, the mingling of
water with wine in the chalice, and the use of incense”\textsuperscript{17} were customs denied. Andrewes’s high
doctrine of the Eucharistic presence, claiming the real presence, was also eliminated. For a
Protestant of this time he was almost unique in using the language of sacrifice in the Holy
Eucharist.\textsuperscript{18} His views, too close to Catholic doctrine, were purged.

Andrewes was an heir to the Christian past. His incarnational Christology was dependant
on ancient Latin and Greek fathers. Even Jesuits found his ecclesiastical traditionalism and mix
of asceticism attractive.\textsuperscript{19} Andrewes has been compared to Ignatius of Loyola as a master of
spiritual piety, especially his devotion to meditation. There is little of kinship with Luther or
Calvin in his thought. His form of anti-Calvinism, Arminianism, High Churchmanship represents
a refutation of Calvinist predestination. Instead, he advocated universal grace by insisting the
Christ died to save all men, not just the elect. Faith and “good works” contributed to that
purpose. Calvinism, with its watertight system of arguments, maintained that only those
predestined could be saved, and that faith was not to be gained or achieved but bestowed on the
elect by God as a sign of His grace. No human desire or activity could alter the will of God. To
committed Calvinists, Arminianism looked too much like Roman Catholicism, with its doctrines
of free will, faith and works, and the universal quality of Christ’s redemptive act. When anti-

\textsuperscript{17} Kenneth Hylson-Smith, \textit{High Churchmanship in the Church of England} (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 22.

\textsuperscript{18} Kenneth Hylson-Smith, 22.

\textsuperscript{19} Maurice F. Reidy, S. J. \textit{Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, Jacobean Court Preacher}. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957). Reidy argued that Andrewes should be considered the “first English Catholic.”
Calvinists turned to art and ceremony, the connection was made complete in the minds of committed Calvinists and Puritans.

Puritans cannot be blamed for mistaking Arminianism for Catholicism. The confusion was real; there was little to separate them on key certain points of agreement. No pope—that was clear—but they shared a great deal of common ground. Some historians, among them Tyack and Graham Parry, have even begun calling some of these anti-Calvinists “English Catholics”. This term may not be far off. The Durham group, the association of clergy surrounding Richard Neile, Bishop of Durham in 1617, who met at “Durham House” in London until 1628, would not have objected to this classification, though they would add “Reformed” Catholics. John Buckeridge, Mathew Wren, John Overall, John Cosin, George Montaigne, and particularly William Laud were men who appreciated the antiquity of the Roman Church, its forms of devotion and order. To a man, they appreciated art as a tool for worship and instruction, and they insisted on the rights and dignity of the monarchy. As Nicholas Tyacke wrote: “The Durham House group provided the first organized opposition to English Calvinism. Its effectiveness derived from the blend of court influence and clerical patronage which [Bishop Neile] exercised.” Parry argued these men attempted to create an Anglican Counter-Reformation. Above all, these priests and bishops insisted they were priests, not ministers. They taught that the physical church building was holy because of its holy use. Their expression of “piety” represents a clear break with Elizabethan and early Jacobean piety, which expressed
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20 Nicholas Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, 123.

reverence for the inner man in a plain and unadorned faith. The Anti-Calvinist attitude had more in common with Counter-Reformation Catholicism than Reformation Calvinism.

The Arminian-anti-Calvinist bishops and clergymen who survived the Civil War were treated no better than Charles for their “Romish Heresies.” Their crime was the image of the Roman Church. Laud, an enthusiastic supporter of the monarchy, went to the chopping block; Matthew Wren went to the tower for twenty years. Others fled the country or “lapsed” back into Calvinism for protection. Laud’s love of art, demonstrated in a gift to his old church at Oxford, The Virgin Porch (Figure 4-4), sealed his fate.

Prynne recorded Laud’s greatest offences. It was a defining moment in the High Church movement, a ceremony unseen for more than fifty years, the consecration of St. Katherine Cree Church (Figure 6-1). Though not present, Prynne’s account of the consecration ceremony in Canterburies Doome resonated with anger at this “popish” superstition. Laud “on his knees at the west end of the church, his arms spread” saying, “this place is holy, and this ground is holy; in the name of the Father, Son and Holy ghost I pronounce it holy.” His description of the Eucharist shows disdain for the sacrament.

The bread was cut and laid in five napkins, and then he gently lifted up one of the corners of the said napkin, and peeped into it until he saw the bread (like a boy that peeped after a bird-nest in a bush) and presently clapped it down again, and flew back a step or two, and then bowed very low three time toward it.22

Prynne suggested the ceremony was taken directly from the Roman Pontifical. Laud’s library had a copy.

St. Giles was also consecrated. Roger Manwaring, a supporter of Laud’s reforms, was rector there. It was richly decorated “by a large skreene, in the figure of a beautiful gate, in

22 William Prynne, Canterburies Doome, 114.
which it’s carved two large pillars, and there large statues: on the one side is Paul, with his sword: on the other Barnabas, with his book: and over them Peter with his Keys. They are all set above with winged cherubims, supported beneath by lions.”23 And something more striking. Standing over them, who but Peter with his keys? Was this not popery? One could hardly distinguish decoration from Catholic idolatry.

John Stow, in *The Survey of London*, describes St. Giles as a veritable hoard of High Church taste. There was a wealth of statuary, painted glass, and eighteen windows in all. The windows were an unusual assemblage of Old Testament patriarchs, prophets and kings. There were Apostles, the Virgin and Child, Mary Magdalene, and over the southwest door “the Figure of our Savior. Over his head, as in a garland supported by two Angels, these letters: IHS. Round about him, Clouds full of Cherubims.”24 IHS, the symbol of the Jesuits and the Counter-Reformation, must have galled Puritans. High Churchmen attempted to return the decorations to pre-Reformation levels. Their artistic template was not their Elizabethan Protestant past; it was contemporary Catholic Europe.

**English Catholics**

The marriage of Henrietta Maria to Charles in 1625 brought in a new wave of Catholic influence in religion and art. The state of confusion among Catholics in England, especially the competition between regular and secular clergy kept them from being a more potent force. They were nonetheless influential both positively and negatively, in their actions and reactions, in the infighting between groups of Catholics. English Catholics were generally divided between those who did or did not favor an episcopal form of government. The Vatican tended to support

23 William Prynne, 115.

regular (order priests) clergy. However, Bishop Smith was consecrated bishop of Chalcedon in October 1627; therefore, England had a Catholic bishop albeit for a short time. Catholics also tried to make themselves as “English” as possible at court.

Through the examination of newsletters published by Catholics, Michael Questier noted that “as contemporaries themselves observed, the ideological circumstances and assumptions of certain sections of the English Catholic community and certain sections of the Church of England’s clergy started, in the 1630’s, to look distinctly analogous.” Bishop Smith and his sympathizers compared their ideals with those of the High Church party of the Church of England. He compared their agreement on art, liturgy, and discipline. The Queen was a rallying point of agreement.

Scholars note the religious pluralism of the councilors of the queen. Though an unapologetic Roman Catholic, she extended patronage beyond her Catholic friends. Henrietta attracted supporters of the French alliance such as Robert Sidney, Earl of Leicester who was an import contact of Bishop Richard Smith after his exile to France. The Percy family was also “friendly” to Catholic sensibilities. Papal legates such as Gregorio Panzani, George Con, and Carlo Rossetti were dispatched to Henrietta Maria. Panzani, in particular was known for pushing his curial masters considering a possible reunion between Rome and London.
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26 Michael C. Questier, 19.


reported signs of cultural agreement. "Every irenic sermon, every uncensored Catholic-sounding doctrine, every insult flung at the “puritan,” every glance cast favorably by Charles toward his Catholic subjects, the Catholic Ambassadors in London, or toward Rome itself, were all picked up on, committed to paper, and then sealed up to be sent to Rome.” It appeared as if a new corner had turned in toleration for Catholics in 1630’s. There were attempts by the Crown and the Catholic Church to modify the Oath of Allegiance; it was made more acceptable in 1636, when Charles drew up modifications friendlier to loyal Catholics. The persecution of Catholics slowed considerably. Publicly, there was a strong relationship between Charles and the papal ambassador Con, which was not a backstairs affair. They genuinely liked each other and discussed important matters freely.

Questier’s research noted that Catholics had reason to hope for a more tolerant England before the Civil War. They noticed that the king thought along lines of agreement with them. During the 1630’s his rhetoric was a perceived threat from Puritanism, not Catholicism. He showed admiration for the inquisition and how it treated troublemakers. Catholic hopes for tolerance from the Caroline regime during the 1630s were two fold. They shared a hierarchical view of the Church as well as a love of Baroque culture, theater, art, and a similar religious piety.

Catholic bishop Richard Smith, writing from Paris in 1635 to William Laud, emphasized that he and Laud shared an interest in avoiding a “creeping attempt” by the laity to take over their churches. Bishops like Brian Duppa, tutor to Prince Charles (later Charles II) and
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Richard Montague, had a favorable view of English Catholics with a common view of episcopal government, love of the arts, and beauty of worship. Both bishops saw a possibility of union between the churches before the Civil War. At the time, the Catholic community that supported the restoration of a hierarchy to England stressed the common ground with Laudians. Through bonds of affection for art, ceremony and order, Catholics could prove their loyalty. They reversed the effects of 75 years of conflict between Catholics and the State before the “Laudian” construction vanished in the 1640’s.

Puritans consistently feared a “Popish Plot.” Given the Crown’s religious policies, Stone observed there was enormous growth of Puritan sentiment against the king.33 Graham Parry noted that much of this resentment came from the perception that foreigners had too much influence with the king.

Since the Reformation, Artists and craftsmen had never worked so hard for the Church [or king] as they did in the twenty years before the Civil War… the Church of Rome had developed exciting new forms as a result of the Council of Trent’s prolonged efforts to make Catholic worship more appealing both to the spirit and to the senses, and, particularly through the medium of the Jesuit order, many of these baroque inventions touched the imagination of English artists and writers looking for more expressive channels for worship and devotion.”34

Foreign ideas and images seemed ever-present.

**The Stuart Attraction to Catholicism**

Early Stuart England (1603-1649) was dramatically transformed by the first two monarchs, James I and Charles I. Less appreciated, the art and architecture of this period, and the politics of the Absolute state, were strongly influenced by Catholic thought and Catholic iconography. James I and VI of Scotland and England was baptized Roman Catholic in Holy Rood Palace in


Edinburgh. His mother had died Roman Catholic, and throughout his life, James claimed both Protestant and Catholic roots. He memorialized his Catholic mother with appropriate Catholic iconography in one of the greatest tombs built in his age. This was the first English royal tomb built since Catholic Henry VII. In Scotland, James encouraged a Catholic party within the nobility for advantage against extreme Protestants. Through the help of important Catholic Peers, in league with Lord Cecil, a smooth transition from Edinburgh to London was achieved. James used the discreet Catholicism of Anne to his political advantage with great Catholic powers invoking a policy of religious reconciliation and dynastic marriage. Unlike Elizabeth, James looked to Europe for culture and art. James was a Scotsman, not an Englishman.

Charles’s attitudes and tastes stemmed from a rich family history. His Danish mother was a discreet Roman Catholic who loved art and ceremony. His older brother looked to the courts of the Medici and the Hapsburg to make some of the most important connections to Italian culture. Most of all, James envisioned a more united European culture, both religious and political. All the early Stuarts embraced art significantly more than the late Tudors. For Charles, art and the use of art, for political as well as religious reasons, guaranteed a sense of self-esteem, authority, public approval, a personal desire for completeness.

Personal factors clearly motivated Charles’s use of the arts. The collections he maintained were legacies from his brother Henry, his mother Anne, and finally James. A significant family issue to recall is that the Stuarts were not truly “English” royals; they did not share the iconoclastic attitudes of earlier monarchs such as Henry VIII or Edward VI. Although Elizabeth was not an iconoclast, she did little to interfere with iconoclasm. The interior of an Elizabethan church was a plain affair. The devotional art surrounding worshipers during Catholic times was destroyed or stripped from many church walls as noted by the *Survey of London*. The chancel
was the place of clergy before the reform. During the Elizabethan times, it became a space for
privileged families. Instead of art, the Elizabethan church was decorated with Bible plaintext on
a whitewashed background. Word triumphed over Image.

Stuart’s tastes were different. Charles was a member of a cosmopolitan Scottish dynasty
closely connected to Italian and French cultural influences. He and James had visited foreign
courts. Charles grew up looking toward the continent, as did his father, mother and older brother.
To make himself equal with European royalty, Charles aimed to establish his credentials, meant
collecting. Travel changed his views. The influence of Catholic Europe caused a change in the
English church, chapel and court. Austere interiors changed slowly. The Chancel was again for
clergy and Sacraments as before the Reformation. Churches became spiritually significant
spaces. Anti-Calvinism and Laudianism triumphed over plainness moving slowly from parish to
parish until the Civil War. This was true not only at Oxford, but in Cambridge, where the anti-
Calvinists at Peterhouse trained the next generation in liturgy and decoration.35

James, even more clearly than Charles, rejected the attitude of the Tudor monarchy, which
essentially turned its back on Europe to strike its own course of “election.” Stuarts rejected
formal portraits that were stiff and often ironically “icon like” in a time when icons were
destroyed. With the exception of Holbein, Tudor taste was a reflection of the late Middle Ages
rather than the Renaissance. Instead, the Stuarts embraced works inspired by classically trained
masters such as Raphael, Mantegna, Giorgione, and especially Titian. The Classicism of these

35 See Graham Parry, *Glory, Laud and Honour: The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation* chapter 4. In Chapter 4 Parry gave a stunning account of the level of renewal in college chapels in Oxford. What is surprising is the level of decorations at Cambridge. Much of the older scholarship does not notice the level of innovation in decoration or liturgical worship at Cambridge, always associated with Calvinism. Though the outlying area may have been Calvinist, many of the schools by 1640 were converted to the Laudian ideal.
masters was more than a style; it exemplified Renaissance Christian art. Elizabeth did not commission or collect art with religious themes, except a few objects in her chapel. The Stuarts displayed them with their collections, often publicly.

If this changing attitude in art created some difficulties, religious war radically re-defined the dynasty. The critical problem Charles faced, central to understanding the early Stuarts, was that their collection and creation in the arts unfolded during the bitterest religious conflict in Europe, the Thirty Years War (1618-1648). At times, Charles capitalized on the discord to acquire his works of art, especially the spectacular Mantua collection in 1629. However, the war generated a significant number of problems at home by further radicalizing Protestants. Anti-Catholic sentiments grew at an alarming rate. More often than not, protests came when the dynasty tried to bridge the gap between warring communions. In the end, the real threat to English monarchy came from radical Protestants, not Catholics.

James’s son-in-law, the husband of Charles’s only living sister, Elizabeth, placed them all in an awkward position regarding the Stuart’s plans for a more unified Europe. It left both monarchs choosing sides in a ruinous religious war. Charles’s intervention on behalf of his sister failed. Charles chose peace. Kevin Sharpe noted the prosperous effects of this policy of peace during the Personal Rule of the 1630’s. Nevertheless, in a world of religious conflict, peace and prosperity were not enough to satisfy those who waged war on popery.

At the center of Stuart policy for détente was the challenge of matchmaking, of contracting marriage with a Catholic Princess. Initially, James hoped a Spanish Match would gain him political and financial independence from increasingly discontented parliament. His greatest
hope to end hostilities was religious, and the hope was not unreasonable. The match spurred on
the use of art and architecture. It allowed for changes to decoration and practice in Chapels
Royal by James. He moderated his view of religion toward traditional bishops and priests such as
Andrewes, and in 1618 welcomed to England a former Catholic Prelate and anti-Machiavellian
theorist, De Dominis. These advisors supported Absolutist notions and encouraged art for
purposes of church and state.

James believed that it was his destiny to accommodate the doctrinal difference of
Christianity based on common belief and practice. He was the first English ruler in more than 40
years to “acknowledge the roman Church to be our Mother Church”. He also claimed, “My faith
is the true, ancient Catholic and Apostolic faith, grounded upon the Scriptures and express word
of God.” From 1619 and thereafter, James, and then Charles, steadily moved the English
Church back toward its Catholic past in the use of art and ceremony. The face of the English
Church soon resembled its Catholic past and the Baroque present. This was their intention.
Given this policy, however, a critical debate in England arose over the definition of “church.” A
pulpit and pamphlet war soon arose over changes in ceremony and art.

A growing number of Puritans in both monarchs’ parliaments believed that
accommodation and union were nothing but a delivery of the English Church back into the hands
of a corrupt papacy. Many Puritans believed they were the true remnant of church, the Elect,
that Divine Providence governed them in religion, not the monarchy. They were passionately
committed to separating England from “popish” ceremonies and idolatry. Charles and his
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bishops had to be halted and the movement had to be reversed. As head of state, Charles would not compromise his prerogative to govern his church.

Charles believed that his kingship came from God. His travels in France and Spain defined him further in this direction. His father’s ideas about absolutism were reinforced; he saw first hand imperial power and prerogative, he also saw collections of art in the service of church and state. He purchased the cartoons by Raphael, portraying the *Acts of the Apostles* for use at the Mortlake tapestry factory, opened by the orders of King James in 1619 for royal service. Magnificent works, such as the *Miraculous Draught of Fishes* (A-113) by Raphael for Pope Leo X, proclaimed the importance of the papacy. Now these works showed the greatness of the Stuarts and their reformed “Catholic” taste.

Purchased by the prince, these religious displays showed a relaxed view toward religious themes as early as 1619. What was Protestant Charles doing with papal propaganda on the eve of his trip to Madrid? The Stuarts wished to show their religion’s connections to Catholicism. The Catholic bride, Spanish or later French, could see that Charles was the Anglican unifier of the Christian faith. English tastes for great religious art would be “accommodated” as simply as a Catholic bride. England would bridge Protestant and Catholic in a shared culture.

James tried to show this commonality when Charles visited Madrid. He gave instructions to Lenard Mawe and Matthew Wren to visit Spain “together with all stuff and ornaments fit for the service of God.”
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faith through English worship. The king directed that prayer be arranged “chappellwise with an altar, frontl, palls, lynnen coverings, demy carpet,” communion was to be in the style of Rome.  

Charles and his closest friend, Buckingham, travelled to Madrid, the greatest imperial city in the seventeenth-century. Because of the intensive building of Philip II, Madrid was also one of Europe’s newest cities. Here Charles saw Hapsburg patronage on a grand scale, Philip’s most audacious design, the imperial center, San Lorenzo del Escorial. Part palace, part monastery, part mausoleum, San Lorenzo overwhelmed the prince. It was a Counter-Reformation statement of absolutism, a monumental affirmation of Catholicism. Complete with libraries, central baslica, crypts and royal apartments, the Escorial was a building program of theater. Charles had never seen anything like it. Even in the twilight of his life, Charles dreamed of creating just such a complex in London.

In Spain, Charles experienced firsthand the greatest ceremonial splendor of any court at this time, except perhaps the Vatican. The English diplomat John Digby noted, “all the streets were adorned, in some places with rich hanging, in other with curious pictures.” Images and icons at once represented the power of empire and the Hapsburg Catholic faith. The experience of Madrid was to the English an artistic revelation. So too were the gifts that were showered on the young prince. Philip III presented Charles Titian’s with majestic Portrait of Charles V with Hound (A-114). It was charged with political, religious, and imperial messages, Titian painted the work to commemorate the coronation of Charles V by Pope Clement VII. Here Charles was


41 John Digby, Earl of Bristol, A true relation and iournall, of the manner of the arrivall, and magnificent entertainment, giuen to the high and mighty Prince Charles, Prince of Great Britaine, by the King of Spaine in his court at Madrid (London: Printed by Iohn Hauiland for William Barret, 1623), 26.
represented as the champion of Christendom and as Holy Roman Emperor. Presenting this masterpiece to the prince was a clear message to both Spanish and English representatives. Phillip was publically inviting Charles to become part of the Hapsburg dynasty through marriage, to accept his crown from the Pope, and to emulate his namesake as defender of the faith. As future king of England, Charles might well have rejected the painting. He did not. James acknowledged the spiritual precedence of the Papacy, but not the political.

In a climate of reconciliation by James, such images were more appealing to the young prince than many observers in England might have liked. Charles had spent the proceeding summer writing to the pontiff that he was “far from plotting anything contrary to the Roman Catholic religion” and that “we may all profess one and the self-same faith”. Even as Charles realized the match was never to be, he continued to purchase religious art, such as an *Our Lady* by Albrecht Dürer. He learned the power of “image” in Spain not in England.

The visit to Madrid expanded Charles and Buckingham’s aesthetic sensibilities. Experiencing the Hapsburg collections first hand also helped Charles turn to the south, to Catholic Europe, for guidance and closer alliance. He might have married one of the many Protestant princesses in Scandinavia or Germany. This seemed never to cross his or his father’s mind. At the same time, he looked to Catholic artists to bring “image” back to England. Orazio Gentileschi arrived eight months after Charles’s coronation in October of 1626. Charles sent Nicholas Lanier to Italy to buy artwork for Whitehall. The greatest coup in art collection was bringing the Mantua collection to London in 1629. Charles soon commissioned Rubens for the Banqueting House Ceiling, and in the following year, Van Dyke became “his painter.” Image, not the plainness of Word, dominated his rule.
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When Charles returned from Madrid with ambitious plans for remodeling Whitehall (based on the Hapsburg palaces in Madrid), he also brought more formal attitudes derived from Spanish royalty. In adopting more sober attire, he reflected a deeper affinity for Hapsburg ideas about collecting, ceremony, and privacy. This visit confirmed his already budding piety and sense of religious responsibility, which was more Counter-Reformation in nature than Calvinist. If he was to guide his people, he had to give responsible witness, to proclaim virtue by encouraging a more “Christianized” court. James’s habits of hunting and drinking, which often took precedence over matters of church and state, were replaced by piety and quiet dignity. Charles worked hard at being king.

Charles’s religion was genuine. He embraced his charge as head of the church in England and expected Englishmen to follow his lead. The rigorous Calvinist approach toward predestination, a pre-ordained and a certain elect, did not appeal to Charles or his father after 1619. These monarchs promoted the anti-Calvinists and guaranteed their eventual control of the English Church. The royal image was consciously fashioned to meet a new political climate. This image was perhaps more religious than political. Charles used great Catholic artists like Rubens, the incomparable Bernini, the Gentileschi, and Van Dyck to provide the iconography of a personal sacred monarchy. Charles’s vision of Kingship was not an “English” invention. Catholic anti-Machiavellians were providing political and theological cover from mid-sixteenth century Spanish emperors, Charles V and kings like Phillip II and Phillip. Rubens created similar works for this dynasty long before his English commissions.

Catholics assisted in expanding the “Culture of Image.” The Catholic Queen, Henrietta Maria, helped Charles through his transformation. Her influence on the Stuart family was felt for the rest of the century. Both of their sons and one of their daughters converted to
Catholicism: Yet, another “revolution” to save England from a “popish plot” in 1688 when James II became king. Nevertheless, before disaster struck, Rubens famously painted Charles and his Queen as St. George slaying the Dragon and rescuing the Virgin. He and his queen bridged the great cataclysm of religion, if only briefly and only on canvas (A-96). In this work, Whitehall is the idyllic background on the banks of the Thames. Rubens, master of iconography, knew the Catholic symbols of the Hapsburgs collections and married them to the Stuarts. Here Rubens transformed England’s king Charles into a Titian emperor symbolized by St. George who crushes the dragon of religious discord. It was the victory of peace between Protestant and Catholic, the promise of banishing conflict from Christendom forever.43 But that was not to be. Charles survived only one month after the last great European religious war ended. Charles was its last victim.

Rubens’s greatest pupil, Van Dyck, also created images of kingship steeped in the continental Catholic mode. In many of these works, Charles seems Christ like. Van Dyck’s works present an overwhelming sense of sheer physical presence. In his royal portraits, he portrayed the Stuarts as loving and in love, noble and authoritative. Like Rubens, Van Dyck raised the political and artistic profile of Henrietta Maria. Often criticized as a frivolous political innocent, she was a genuine force in court in sponsoring plays, music, masques, and commissions. Henrietta Maria also established an alternative court at Somerset House, much as Anne undertaken earlier. Somerset was a welcome home for a diverse group of Catholics and Catholic sympathizers, and even a few Puritans. It was also a place of political intrigue.

Charles’s queen drew two of the most astute public officials into her influence, Sir Francis Windebank and Francis Cottington. Her adherence to her faith went unchallenged by Charles. Henrietta pursued her faith with pious sincerity. This made her unpopular with Puritans and some anti-Calvinists. Yet, through the commissions of Catholic chapels, such as Somerset House, her religion was both provocative and imitated. Jones’s baroque design, with niches and statues of St. Peter and St. Paul, the high altar, by sculptor François Dieussart, which ignited the “excited admiration, joy, and adoration in Her Majesty and all the Catholics”, set the artistic standard for the rest of the decade. As Charles claimed: “He had never seen anything more beautiful.” In these chapels, Van Dyck, Gentileschi, and other Englishmen connected to the court and practiced their Catholic faith relatively unfettered. The charge that Charles was “soft” on Catholics is accurate when it came to his wife, artists, and those he favored.

The Queen’s activities at court went far beyond commissioning chapels. She was instrumental in re-establishing the first direct diplomatic relations between London and the papacy since Henry VIII and Mary I. This paved the way to obtaining one of the greatest collaborations in art. Through Henrietta’s correspondence with Pope Urban VIII, Bernini sculpted the legendary bust of Charles using Van Dyck’s triple portrait. Bernini often constructed his works to represent divinely-given majesty to his patrons. Charles’s bust was the only one commissioned for a Protestant monarch.

Contact with Rome had detractors. William Prynne, in his assault on theater (as well as an assault on Henrietta Maria) listed many offences of the Queen. Histriomastix was a criticism of


45 Raymond Needham and Alexander Webster, 114.
laughter, music, dancing, play going, bonfires, effeminacy and “the very art of making pictures and images as the occasion of Idolatry.” 46 It was a thinly veiled attack on Charles. Prynne’s writings showed the insurmountable gap growing between Puritans and the royal court. Charles continued to re-create baroque culture and celebrate his continental sensibilities.

Charles issued few pronouncements on art. Like most kings, this was too trivial a matter to set pen to paper. Yet, in one of his rare comments on art, Charles shows a sovereign’s eye for the political power of image. He told the Lord Keeper in 1638 that the works he had commissioned and collected were “lasting monuments remaining to posterity.” 47 The works of Mytens, Le Surer, Bernini, Gentileschi, and Van Dyck were indeed monuments. However, there is no more enduring example of art for “posterity” than the Banqueting House project. Its ceiling made it a living mausoleum like the Escorial; a remembrance to King James. 48 Though the Banqueting House Ceiling served the memory of James, Charles was embodied in its iconographical statements. Like his father, Charles, was an unquestioned priest-king, just as Lucas de Here had portrayed Philip II as Solomon (A-14) at St. Bavo in Ghent.

The ceiling portrayed a brilliant fusion of Catholic Counter-Reformation style and political imagery, this with only a few hints of Protestant symbolism. The motifs, mostly Catholic, combined a range of iconography. Here Rubens took Minerva from his Lion Hunt, the Roman architecture from Raphael’s Acts of the Apostles, and then integrated Guido Reni’s Hercules and the putti of Giulio Romano. Nothing could be more Counter-Reformation than the Apotheosis

46 William Prynne, Histriomastix, the Player’s Scourge or Actor’s tragedie . . . , 901.


(A-50), with its familial style that fused an imperial triumph with the Assumption of the Virgin. Most striking was the integration of iconography placing the altar in the hands of religion (A-50), the same motif Rubens used for the Medici in France (A-87). The double connotations of Solomonic columns seen in Rubens Wise Rule of James I (Figure 8-1) linked James to Solomon, which recalled the great works of Bernini in Rome (Figure 6-2, 6-3) celebrating ultimate Christian triumph of Eucharistic sacrifice. William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury at St. Mary the Virgin Oxford (Figure 4-4), incorporated this same theme time by framing the doors of the main entrance with Solomonic columns as a triumphal entrance.

**Catholic Sympathies and Attitudes**

The commitment to engage Catholicism by James, Henry, Anne, and Charles was genuine. It expressed confidence that the Roman Church was a true part of the “catholic church.” These commitments represent a remarkable change from the age of Elizabeth. Opponents of the Stuarts never understood this accommodation. Starting with the Spanish delegation invited to London, which sought to restore relations with Catholic Europe (1604), James opened England to trade and cultural renewal. The intimate circles of the early Stuarts included many powerful Catholic figures that shaped the political, religious, and cultural attitudes of the monarchy. Even the “great Protestant hope” Prince Henry had an immediate circle of advisors that included Catholics or Catholic sympathizers, notably Lord Lumley, Thomas Howard, and Inigo Jones. In certain respects, Lord Lumley led the way in England in the new fashion for displaying religious images. At the end of his days, Lord Cecil also showed movement toward Catholic Counter-Reformation tastes in his chapel. Nothing like it had been built in England since the time of Mary Tudor.

Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, another member of the Catholic Howard family, enthusiastically supported Cecil’s plans for James’s gaining the English throne. Henry was appointed to the Privy Council and remained a close advisor until his death in 1614. Displayed in his galleries were a wide range of religious paintings, including *St. Francis* and *Christ holding the Cross*, and other images showing his religious allegiance, among them three portraits of Mary Queen of Scots and a portrait of Mary Tudor, the last Catholic queen of England.50

For Anne, a discreet Roman Catholic, the collection and commission of art represent attempts to regain her diminishing royal authority. They also comforted her loss of loved ones, especially her children. Anne’s collections grew significantly after the marriage of her daughter to the Elector of the Palatinate and the death of Henry. Art was an obvious expression of her Catholic faith, and toward the end of her life, she displayed a substantial number of devotional images and the paraphernalia of Catholic worship.51 Anne spent her last days sitting in her gallery, admiring paintings of Christ, Mary Magdalene, the Virgin Mary, and the Passion.52

With Anne’s death, Charles became the official guardian of the family memory, particularly of his mother and brother. Anne’s collection was substantial and had a significant influence on Charles in forming the nucleus of his own growing collection. It also gave him


51 M. T. W. Payne, “An Inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark’s ‘ornaments, furniture, householde stuffe, and other parcels’ at Denmark House,” *Journal of the History of Collections*, 13, 1 (2001), 23-44. Anne’s invitories show a significant number of religious artworks.

52 Anonymous, “Madame the Queen’s Death, and Maner thereof,” in *Miscellany of the Abbotsford Club*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1837), 81.
solace, as is clear from the frontispiece (A-45) of *Eikon Basilike*, which suggests a very Christ-like Charles in the Garden of Gethsemane suffering like ‘King Jesus’.

The Howards had a particular taste for absolutist and Counter-Reformation art. Their patronage of Jones, the trips abroad for James and Charles (despite their occasional problems with the Stuarts), testifies to their importance, especially as Charles developed his artistic tastes. Their fate was the same--disgrace and displacement--and even though Lord Arundel converted to Anglicanism, he was finally reconciled to Rome. His heart is buried in a Franciscan church. Whether welcome or unwanted, Catholicism played an influential role in the politics, art, and religious development of early Stuart England. Through the leadership of James and Charles Stuart—given their commitment to Catholicism and its art, energy, and forms of worship—England enjoyed a vibrant renaissance before the Civil War. Once again, church and state joined together as a patron of the arts, and England embraced the spirit of the baroque that shaped Catholic Europe and the Absolute state. The Stuarts slowly thawed the icy grip of Calvinism on English art. Though much of what was created would be destroyed during the Civil War, evidence suggests that England’s major artistic achievements took inspiration from Catholic Europe. An Anglo-Catholic spirit struggled and finally succeeded in an otherwise failed Counter-Reformation. In the end, the English achievement was led by anti-Calvinists and Laudians, by James and Charles Stuart, and by their Catholic Queens. The Stuarts left their mark.
Figure 8-1. Sir Peter Paul Rubins. *Wise Rule of James I*, Banqueting House. Photo by author.
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A-12. *Three versions of Bernini’s Bust of Charles I*, which was destroyed in 1698: plaster (left) Francis Bird's copy (center) and engraving by Robert Van Voerst (right), (Charles Avery: *Bernini: Genius of the Baroque*), 224.


A-42. Maximilian Colt. Tomb of Robert Cecil, 1st earl of Salisbury, d.1612, (Brian Kemp, English Church Monuments), 76.

A-43. Nave with Pulpit of Bishop William Knight, next to and to the right of Sugar Chantry, (http://vrcoll.fa.pitt.edu/medart/image/england/wells/cathedral-complex/Cathedral/Interior/Wells-Cath-interior.html)


A-45. Charles the Martyr, from Eikon Basilike, (Pauline Gregg, King Charles I), 244.

A-46. Elizabeth I and King Solomon, Thomas Morton, Solomon or a Treatise Declaring the State of the Kingdom of Israel (1596), (John King, Tudor Royal Iconography), 258.


A-51. Rubens. The Union of Scotland and England (center) with the Allegories of Hercules (left) and Minerva (right) (Gregory Martin: Rubens: The Ceiling Decoration of the Banqueting House, 2005), pl. 4.

A-52. Rubens. The Unification of the Kingdoms (center) with Wisdom (Minerva) left, Suppressing Sedition and Virtue (Hercules) right, Overcoming Discord (Gregory Martin: Rubens: The Ceiling Decoration of the Banqueting House, 2005), pl. 5.

A-53. The Temple of Castor and Pollux, annotated by Inigo Jones in his copy of Palladio’s Quattro Libri (Venice, 1601), iv, pl 96. (Worcester College, Oxford) in (John Bold and Edward Chaney, English Architecture Public and Private), fig. 16.


A-64. Unknown. Mary Queen of Scots Memorial Portrait (Jayne Elizabeth Lewis: Mary Queen of Scots Romance and Nation), 68.

A-65. Isaac Oliver, Head of Christ, 2” by 1 5/8” (Jill Finsten, Isaac Oliver Art at the Courts of Elizabeth I and James I, 1981) Figure 87.

A-66. Isaac Oliver, Madonna and Child in Glory, 1615 11” by 8”. The Madonna is seated, full-length in clouds. She holds the child at her left. He is portrayed golden haired and white robed, holds the orb in his left hand and makes the sign of the cross with his right hand (Jill Finsten, Isaac Oliver: Art at the Courts of Elizabeth I and James I, 1981), Figure 79.


A-78. Daniel Mytens. *Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel*, c 1618 (Karen Hearn, Editor, *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England, 1530-1630*), Figure 140.


A-81. Peter Paul Rubens, *Lady Arundel and Her Entourage*, 1620 (Karen Hearn, Editor, *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England, 1530-1630*), Figure 141.


A-90. Johannes Kip. *Engraved view of Chapel fitted out for Roman Catholic Services*. 1686-1688. The Queen’s Chapel by Inigo Jones built 1623-1625 as engraved in 1688 when it still functioned as a Catholic chapel for Catherine of Braganza, the Queen.
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